

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

---

NO. XCI.—JANUARY, 1858.

---

## ART. I.—CHRISTIAN WOMEN OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

THE principles of virtue taught by our Saviour were eminently pure and lofty. They enjoined upon all a benevolence the most disinterested, a zeal for the truth the most ardent, a sanctity the most unspotted, and a courtesy the most refined. The white robes worn by the newly baptized were emblematical of that life which they were called to live; a life unsoiled by malice, or guile, or selfishness; a life of integrity, beneficence and self-denial; a life controlled by reason and conscience, ornamented by deeds of charity, and beaming with the first rays of a lustrous moral day; a life which pronounced itself at every stage to be but the shadow of a glory to come. Christianity summoned her votaries to relinquish earthly distinction and repose, the gilded joys of wealth, and the shining garments of fashion, to forego immediate and captivating pleasures for the sake of a remote and invisible good, to choose lowliness and scorn during the present life, for the weal of the soul and the spiritual delights of a world unseen.

It might therefore have been presumed, that *man*, calm, thoughtful, calculating, would be most inclined to the new religion, and, of all men, that *philosophers* trained to reasoning, superior to appetite and passion, able to think deeply and decide wisely, would soonest embrace a faith so well authenticated, so comprehensive, and so elevating. But it must be recorded to the honor of *woman*, that her

readiness to adopt this holy religion was greater than man's, her heart was truer than the philosopher's head, and a large proportion of the early Church consisted of devout and gentle females. Most of them, it is true, were from the lower ranks of society. Poor, illiterate, oppressed, familiar with toil, and strangers to luxury, they greeted with joy the doctrine of a world to come, in which all inequalities are to be compensated, and "all odds made even." Many such, with no silk or pearls for outward adorning, were beautiful in the sight of angels, for they wore "the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit." They possessed a true delicacy and elevation of soul, which raised them above their social position, and made them superior in virtue and womanly grace to all their pagan sisters. "What wives these Christians have!" was the envious but admiring exclamation of a heathen philosopher in view of excellence which surpassed his comprehension.

But all Christian females at this early period were not of plebeian origin. Some were connected by birth or marriage with the first nobility. We are told by Tertullian, that matrons of the highest rank in Carthage were ready to die for their faith. Alexandria was the home of rich and accomplished females who allied themselves to the best cause. Eusebius reckons the Empress Mamæa among the faithful; and Origen was summoned from Egypt into Syria, that she might hear the truth from his lips. Alexander Severus knew certain very distinguished women to be of this sect, and not only refrained from doing them injury, but also honored them with a testimony in their favor, and openly withstood the people raging for their blood. According to Lactantius, when *Diocletian* began to persecute the Church, "his rage was directed not merely against his domestics, but against all, and especially against *Valeria*, his daughter, and *Prisca*, his wife, both of whom he compelled to offer sacrifice." Without doubt many of Cæsar's household, many a high-born maiden of Rome, was a friend to Jesus. But for such a one to desert the august worship of paganism, and choose the creed of a new and up-start community; for a woman tenderly nurtured and guarded to haz-



ard the loss of wealth and protection, and perhaps of life; for a sensitive female, moving in the first circles of Rome, or Athens, or Alexandria, to exile herself from patrician society, and embrace the fellowship of a "sect everywhere spoken against,"—was no slight proof of strong integrity, far-sighted discernment, and unwavering love. Yet many took this course, and illustrated these virtues. "Rich and poor met together," in the primitive Church. For the sake of a common hope, the high-born and fair walked softly down into the valley of humiliation, and cast in their lot with those of meaner name and coarser vestments. Affinity of spirit drew together and united in sympathy those whom every other force would separate most widely and inevitably. For no higher barriers or broader intervals divided the women of ancient times than those which noble and ignoble parentage, or the various grades of social rank, interposed and maintained.

But there was a readiness on the part of woman, in the period of which we speak, not only to receive the truth, but also to *diffuse* it. She was not content with personal safety, but longed to have others share in the good which she had proved. Paul makes honorable mention of several females who co-operated with him in the Gospel. Apollos, the eloquent orator, was taught the way of God more perfectly by Priscilla as well as Aquila. From the primitive records of our faith, we learn that many widows were set apart to the service of Christ and the Church. All their time was employed in ministering to the sick, in providing homes for the outcast, or in visiting those of their own sex who were prevented by pagan relatives from conversing with their pastor. And it should here be remembered, that in all the Roman Empire, well nigh absolute authority was granted to a husband over his wife, and to a father over his children. Nor does the fact deserve less attention, that when morals degenerate and vice increases, men are liable to become suspicious, and guard their domestic circle with jealous tyranny. On both accounts—at the introduction of Christianity—wives and daughters were frequently denied the privilege of social worship, and of inviting the bishop

to their homes. And therefore, females who possessed the requisite qualifications were entrusted with a sacred office, and called to impart counsel and comfort where others might not appear. Engaging with their accustomed earnestness in so divine a work, they could half forget the loneliness of widowhood, and make their experience in affliction a blessing to the saints. Many a Roman wife was encouraged by their counsel to bear with patience the harshness of her lord, and was made strong in spirit by the heavenly manna which they brought to her dwelling. But intelligence was prerequisite to the wise discharge of this service; and therefore at the very outset did our holy religion honor the *mind*, as well as the heart of woman, and begin to prophecy and foreshadow her present social elevation. The spirit of paganism was adverse to female education. The daughters of noble blood in ancient Greece or Rome were taught the arts of weaving and embroidery, and trained up to preside in the kitchen and adorn the body; but they were strangers to the honey of literature and the sweet wine of philosophy. A famous poet, who flourished in the first century after Christ, satirizes a familiar acquaintance with grammar, logic or history on the part of a Roman matron—" *Sit non doctissima conjux.*" "Save me from a learned wife," prays another servant of the muses; adding, by way of justification, "that I may have sleep at night and peace by day;" just, forsooth, as if mental culture would destroy the gentleness of woman. But the spirit of Christianity, from the beginning, has been friendly to female education and influence. It has asserted the inherent dignity of woman, and has given her a position in society not a whit lower than man's. We are bound, however, to infer, from the anxious particularity with which the Fathers caution females chosen to a religious office against loquacity, that their social tendencies could not be freely indulged without hazard to the peace of families and the cause of truth. At this point lurked their strongest foe.

But the benevolence of these individuals found still other modes of activity. The heart of many an outcast and or-

phan was made to leap for joy by their timely assistance. For, although there was monstrous cruelty in the act, heathen parents, as we collect from the testimony of their own writers, were then addicted to the crime of exposing their infant progeny in the streets; amply meriting by this conduct the sentence which pronounces them to have been "without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." It is further known, that before the spread of Christianity these unfortunate children were mostly suffered to perish, or were rescued from death to be bred up in slavery and sin. How bright the era which now dawned upon them! Forth went in earliest morn the messengers of life, and soft arms transported the forsaken ones to abodes of peace. And, besides, women of the primitive Church were sometimes touched with pity for the slave, and led to redeem him from bondage. To this course they were moved by their solicitude for the salvation of men, no less than by the compassionate feelings which Christianity enkindles and refines. We are told that *Callisto*, a noble widow of Smyrna, early one morning went to a certain gate of the city, and found a little child of Eastern origin. Learning that he was a slave, and attracted by the intelligence and sweetness of his face, she bought him with her money, adopted him as her son, taught and won him to the Christian faith, trusted him with the management of her property, and finally made him heir of all. But this purchased lad was *Polycarp*, afterwards for half a century Bishop of the Church in Smyrna, and then immortalized by the testimony for Christ which he bore at his martyrdom. For in presence of an angry crowd, vociferating at intervals, "Polycarp to the lions!" and solicited again and again by the Pro-Consul to curse Jesus and deliver himself from death, the venerable saint offered this child-like and touching response, "*Eighty and six years have I served Him, and He has done me no wrong; how then can I curse my King and my Saviour?*" To rescue this man from heathen slavery, and educate him for so useful a life and so sublime a death, was no minor service to Christianity. Yet we are allowed to believe in the occurrence of many similar instances during the first three centuries,



when our holy faith was proscribed, and its friends hunted and slain.

Moreover, female servants often introduced the religion of Christ into heathen families. Celsus, who seizes every possible occasion to twit and taunt believers, after saying of the way in which their faith was diffused, "You shall see weavers, tailors, fullers, and the most rustic and illiterate fellows, when before their elders and betters, as mute as fishes; but when they can get a few children and silly women by themselves, they wax eloquent forthwith, and prate marvellous things,"—Celsus then goes on to sneer at the influence of chamber-maids, in favor of Christianity, over Roman matrons and their children; thus, in the very spleen and bitterness of his heart against the truth, paying a high compliment to the intelligence and fidelity of those servants. He intended to brand the Gospel as a shallow superstition, propagated by ignorance, and fit only to impose upon credulous women, while, at the same time, he lauded polytheism to the skies as accordant with reason and philosophy; but the civilized world has long since reversed his judgment, cast his argument and belief to the winds, and now attributes a value to his work only in so far as it elucidates the behavior of Christians in that early age.

Above all, mothers infused the principles of genuine virtue into the minds of their children, and prepared many a favorite son, by Christian nurture, to bear the toil and brave the danger then associated with a preacher's life. Accept the following examples from the fourth century in illustration of their faithfulness. For the scanty records of the early Church warn us to consult a later period for personal biography, especially for that of females.

After the death of her husband, *Anthusa*, though hardly twenty years of age, devoted herself to the education of her son; and the life of that son, whose golden words and enlightened zeal gave him the foremost place in all the East, is the memorial of her worth. The Church was indebted to the influence of *Anthusa* for the labors of Chrysostom.

Meanwhile in the West a yet mightier intellect and deeper soul was yielding at last, after long conflict with lust and

pride, to the voice of truth, and *Monica*, whose yearning faith had never faltered in the darkest hour, saw her distinguished son a child of hope and a champion for his Lord. Whenever, therefore, the name of *Augustine* is pronounced, let there be added also that of *Monica*, his gentle and heroic teacher. It is impossible to estimate the good received by such men from mothers, who were thus careful to ply them with every loving and pious motive, and to bury deep in the soil of their hearts the seeds of heavenly wisdom.

It has also been truly remarked, that the love of primitive believers to one another was exceedingly great. This resulted in part from the heartiness and depth of their religious sentiments. Few bore the Christian name, in honor, solely, of their intellectual convictions. Only the earnest and sincere would avow the truth when persecution drew her glittering sword before them. And in part it resulted from their sharing in common perils and reproaches. Cast out of pagan society by its cruelty or its vice, they clung more closely to one another. Of females we learn in particular, that their kindness to the suffering was proverbial. They watched over the sick with heroic constancy and tender solicitude. They were hospitable to the stranger, and remembered those in bonds as bound with them. *Lucian*, the prince of mockers, bears witness to this truly feminine and beautiful trait of character. With the design of ridiculing the simplicity of Christians, he makes them welcome a stranger and hypocrite into their society, advance him rapidly from one office to another, and at last honor him as their chief teacher. Presently, however, he is cast into prison, and Christian women are described as hastening to his relief, and sparing neither labor nor expense to mitigate his sufferings. *Tertullian* urges this custom as a reason why Christian females should not accept of pagan husbands. "What pagan," he inquires, "would permit his wife to go about and visit the sick, even in the dwellings of poverty? or entertain in her house a Christian traveler? or, in times of persecution, steal into the prison and kiss the martyr's chains?" The fury against Christians was frequently so great, that confessors must be visited, if at all, at the risk

of life. Thrust into close and gloomy cells, they were alternately tortured and starved for the purpose of breaking their spirits, and forcing them to abjure their belief. It was then that woman's tenderness outran the courage of man. Noiselessly she glided into the dungeon, gave to the fainting sufferer a cup of cold water in the name of the Lord, whispered to him a message of peace, and was gone. The gentle hands of wife and mother were busy, even when men's hearts failed them for fear, and for looking after those things which were coming on the earth. There may have been somewhat of superstition, and undue reverence for martyrs, in that kissing of their chains of which Tertullian speaks, but there was far more of fearless virtue and self-forgetting charity in the work of peril which they performed.

Nor should we diminish this praise on the ground of any presumed lenity then shown to females, rendering a course of action well nigh safe for them, which would have been fraught with danger to men. In times of persecution, the "tender mercies of paganism were cruel." The rage which thirsted for the blood of Polycarp was unrelenting and indiscriminate. Delicate women were many times subjected to tortures and abuses worse than death. A letter from Pliny, the accomplished scholar, and mild governor of Bithynia, to the Emperor of Rome, respecting Christians, may be cited in proof of this statement. In a province thronged with believers of either sex and of every rank, he did not blush to apply the torture to females, and to report their words to his master. They were chosen, it is natural to presume, as *less resolute* than men, and consequently more likely to testify of crimes imputed to their society. Behold the merciless policy of heathen courts when dealing with Christians! Yet the two women whom Pliny thus examined bore witness to the virtue and harmlessness of believers; and the only crime which he was able to charge upon the friends of Christ, in his letter to Trajan, was a certain inflexible and guilty obstinacy. He was led to exonerate them fully from every accusation of treasonable or immoral conduct.

*Perpetua* was the daughter of noble parents, who resided



in the rich suburbs of Carthage. She was favored with a superior education, and at length became a Christian. When the persecution under Geta broke out, she had already been married, and was the mother of an infant child. But her father was still a pagan; and although he may have cared but little for her change of belief in times of repose, he was now appalled by the rising storm, and strove to make her renounce Christianity. "Do you see that jar?" she once said in reply, pointing to a vessel before them. "We can call it no other than what it is, a jar. So also must I call myself no other than what I am, a Christian." She was soon seized and thrust into prison, to endure excruciating pain. As the time of her trial drew near, her father again entreated her to recant. "My child," he cried, "pity my gray hairs, have compassion on thy father, if I am still worthy of being called a father by thee. Have I not with these hands led thee up to the bloom of life? Have I not preferred thee to both thy brothers? O, then, make me not a disgrace among men! Look on thy brother! thy mother! thy son! who cannot survive thy death. O, dismiss your high notions, and involve us not in ruin!" To strengthen this appeal, he cast himself at her feet, kissed her hand, and called her by every dear and familiar name. It was a sore trial to her faith. But she remembered the paramount claims of her Lord, and replied, "Father, that will take place which God wills. For know, we are not in our own power, but in the hand of God." When brought before the tribunal, that weeping father was present, hoping to turn her from Christ, but not to soften the heart of her judge. "Have pity on thy child," was his final plea; and the procurator himself admonished her, "Spare the gray hairs of thy father, spare the youth of thy child, and offer sacrifice to the Emperor." But she answered, "It cannot be!" After confessing herself to be a Christian, she was sentenced to be torn in pieces by wild beasts at the next festival, and was remanded to prison. Once more between her condemnation and her death was the patient sufferer visited by her father, now devoured with sorrow, yet unable to give up the hope of his daughter's yielding. But

her tongue refused to utter a falsehood. She was a believer in Christ, and could not deny it. When the day of heathen joy arrived, and a multitude of confessors were led into the arena of their last conflict, Perpetua and her friend Felicitas were exposed to a wild cow. The assault of this furious animal, as was often the case, only mangled without slaying them. But youthful gladiators, at the call of a raging multitude, soon approached, put a period to their suffering, and opened to them the gates of joy.

"And one of the Elders answered, saying unto me, 'What are these which are arrayed in white robes, and whence came they?' And I said unto him, 'Sir, thou knowest.' And he said unto me, 'These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple: and He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.'"

*Ex una disce omnes.* The martyrdom of Perpetua illustrates the way in which genuine Christians were then accustomed to bear witness for the truth. Nor can it be surprising that fortitude so unshaken frequently convinced the understanding of opponents, and led them to embrace, like Paul, the faith which they once destroyed.

"You may *kill*, but you cannot *harm* us," said Justin Martyr to Antoninus Pius and the Roman Senate.

"Rack, torture, condemn, destroy us," says Tertullian. "Your injustice is a proof of our innocence, and therefore God permits us to suffer these things. The oftener you mow us down, the greater do our numbers become. *The blood of Christians is seed.* Many of your own writers, as Cicero, Seneca, Diogenes, exhort to endurance of anguish and death; yet their words have never made so many disciples as Christian deeds. That very obstinacy which you reproach in us is a convincing teacher. For who is not led by witnessing it to inquire what there is in our cause? And who after examination does not join our ranks? And when he has joined, who does not long to suffer, that he may render highest thanks to God, and secure a full pardon at the price of his blood? For martyrdom is crowned with forgiveness of all sins. Hence we give thanks when you pronounce sentence of death; for, by a sort of rivalry between the human and the divine, when we are condemned by you we are absolved of God."

Principles are eternal. After the lapse of many centu-

ries, the greatest nominal Church of Christendom took to herself the sword and the torch of persecution, and suffered not the dead to rest, even in their graves. The body of John Wyckliffe had been thirty years in repose, when, by order of the Tridentine Council, his bones were taken from their place, reduced to ashes, and thrown into the river which still passes the town of Lutterworth. "Thence," in the language of Fuller, "they were conducted to the Severn, the narrow seas, and the ocean; and thus became the emblem of his doctrine, which was to flow from the province to the nation, and from the nation to the many kingdoms of the world." Truth has little to fear in any age from the violence of her foes. Her deepest wounds are received in the house of her friends.

But the story of Perpetua's death suggests a peculiarity in the condition of Christian females, during the period to which my remarks must be limited. They were often associated with idolaters by the most intimate and sacred ties of life. Wives and daughters were many times converted, while their husbands or parents still adhered to the old polytheism. In such cases they were environed with difficulties and beset with temptations. They were taught to look upon idolatry with horror and dread. Yet the kitchen hearth was consecrated to false divinities. Hard by stood the images of the Lares, and upon it burned the sacred lamp. Every wife was expected to offer incense and libations to these domestic gods. But how could a Christian woman perform such unholy rites? Or how could she refuse to observe them without provoking the wrath of her husband? Moreover, when a pagan family sat down to the daily meal, libations were poured out in honor of wood or stone; and on joyous occasions the pantomimic dance and profane song were required. But what Christian could participate in such festal scenes? or what pagan husband would understand the scruples of his wife, and indulge them without a frown? Besides, polytheism filled the houses of her votaries with emblems of evil. Walls and furniture were decorated with her symbols. Cup and plate were embossed with her devices. At every step a Christian woman



would encounter something calculated to offend her purity or wound her conscience. The reign of Venus was co-extensive with that of Jove; vice rode triumphant by the side of superstition. It is not, therefore, easy to exaggerate the personal self-denial and fortitude shown by females who embraced the truth and were faithful to Christ, while their husbands continued in paganism. When Naaman, the Syrian, had been cured of his leprosy, had acknowledged the true God, and had "promised to offer neither burnt offering nor sacrifice to other gods," he added these significant words, "In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing." How many a Christian wife, during the first three centuries, must have been sorely tempted to offer a petition similar to this! It was no trivial matter to sustain the anger of a Roman husband, proud of his country and his injured gods. But it was a still greater trial to bear the revenge of a mean and vindictive soul. In the second apology of Justin, we find the following narrative. A woman of Rome, who had trod the paths of vice with her husband, was at length made acquainted with the principles of Christianity and heartily received them. Forsaking her former associates, she led a pure and blameless life. But, in defiance of all entreaties, her husband persevered in his former course. Though troubled and grieved, she was persuaded to remain with him, and endeavor by fidelity and gentleness to win him to the faith. But in vain. He grew worse and worse. Leaving Rome he visited Alexandria, where his conduct became yet more infamous than ever before. The wife now trembled, lest by continuing his companion, she should be involved in the guilt of his impious deeds. Moved by this salutary dread, she resorted to the proper measures and obtained a divorce. The infuriated man then determined upon revenge, and, as the readiest means of seizing it, accused her of being a Christian. Acquainted with the spirit of heathenism, she foresaw the inevitable result, and entreated the Emperor but for time

to arrange her domestic affairs, before answering with her life the charge preferred against her. This moderate petition was granted. But the rage of her repudiated husband, balked for the moment in this direction, soon fell upon another victim, and rejoiced in the swift and cruel execution of her teacher in the Christian faith. It will be observed that this woman did not separate from her husband on the ground of his adhesion to paganism, but on that of his out-breaking vices. Paul had long before laid down the rule, that a husband's unbelief could not justify his wife in forsaking him. Yet her life was likely to be one of many sorrows. Sometimes her transition from idolatry to the true religion proved not only a signal for her own persecution, but also for that of believers in general. Thus *Herminianus*, governor of Cappadocia, was embittered by the conversion of his wife against the whole body of Christians, and pursued them with exceeding cruelty. At other times, converted women were compelled by force to observe the rites of idolatry. *Bona*, a Christian of Carthage, was dragged away by her husband to a pagan altar, and while others held her hands, was made to offer sacrifice, though protesting that she had no part or lot in the act. Frequently, however, men were led to the reception of Christianity by the "chaste conversation," the beautiful patience, fidelity and affection of their wives. Such was the effect of conjugal excellence upon the fathers of Augustine and of Gregory Nazianzen. And Tertullian remarks, that a husband, while yet clinging to his national superstition, was frequently made to realize, by the change in his wife, "how awful goodness is." "He perceives great things, has seen proofs, knows that she has become better; and therefore refrains from opposition to her new worship." And doubtless the charms of this conjugal excellence were heightened by contrast: since, in that degenerate age, marriage had nearly ceased to wear the robes of sanctity and virtue. "Where is that happiness in matrimony," says one, "which springs from good morals, and by which, through almost six hundred years after Rome was founded, no house witnessed a divorce? Now with females, by reason of gold,

every limb is heavy, by reason of wine no lip is free, and divorce is longed for as if it were a fruit of marriage." It was an age of display, of outward splendor and inward misery. The grand ideas of Roman ladies were a terror to young men of moderate wealth; and a pride that we can easily excuse, led many to shrink from the dependence which was then sure to follow a union with an heiress. This pride condensed itself at length into fitting words: *Intolerabilius nihil est, quam fœmina dives*,—"a rich wife is the bane of life." Language quite inapposite, we believe, at present; as female character has greatly improved since the period in question; as gentleness and modesty now lead Mammon oft in chains; and as men of the highest spirit are known to woo the fair, though likely to be encumbered with an ample dowry.

But while a general agreement prevailed among Christians in regard to the apostle's precept—"The woman which hath an husband that believeth not . . . let her not leave him," there was more diversity of opinion concerning the application of his words, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." Some hesitated to understand this language as referring to marriage, and were disposed to maintain that Christianity would be the gainer should her adherents take so prominent a place in heathen families. Ambitious parents coveted for their daughters an alliance with men of rank or wealth, and suffered their religious scruples to melt away before the prospect of worldly advantages. Generally, however, they seem to have stipulated in the nuptial contract for the wife's spiritual freedom, and not rarely for her control over the religious education of her children. But even with the aid of such a compact, her path of life must still be thick-set with snares and pit-falls. Innumerable and unforeseen collisions must take place in matters both of principle and of taste. Nothing short of the tenderest love could make a union of this kind desirable. Wherever the chief motive to its formation grew out of family interest or pride, misery and sin must naturally follow. Hence Christian writers of this period strongly object to mixed marriages. Tertullian warns the



Christian female of dangers to which she will expose her religious life by marriage with a heathen, and enumerates some of the interruptions, troubles and perils to which she will be liable.

"When the wife wishes to observe a day of special devotion, the husband appoints it for the baths; if a fast is to be kept, the husband makes a feast on the same day. If she wishes to leave home for a religious object, never does household business fall more upon her hands. And who would allow his wife, for the sake of visiting the brethren, (who are sick,) to go about from street to street, the round of strange cottages, even the poorest? Who would willingly bear her being parted from his side, for nightly meetings, if needs be? Who would endure, without anxiety, her being away all night at the solemnities of Easter? Who would let her go without suspicion to that feast of the Lord which they defame? Who would suffer her . . . to offer water for the saints' feet? to wait upon them with their food and drink? to long for them, and have them in her thoughts? If a stranger brother come, what lodging could he expect in an alien's house? And if a present is to be made to any, lo, the barns and fruit stores are closed." "Canst thou keep it secret when thou markest thy bed or thy body with the sign of the cross? When thou risest in the night to pray, wilt thou not appear to be practising a kind of magic?"

These words of the austere African point out a few of the trials to be met by a Christian wife united to a pagan husband. It would be easy to suggest still others, but the purpose of this article does not require it.

But one might fairly charge the account here given of Christian women in the first three centuries with a grave defect, should it omit all notice of their dress. For as females are endowed by their Creator with more personal beauty than men, so, too, have they commonly shown more interest in the work of adorning that beauty. Gifted with a nicer appreciation of the graceful and pleasing, and conscious, to some extent, of their superior charms, they have often sought to make the most of their advantages, using the resources of art to multiply the fascinations of nature. In so far as her regard to personal appearance is the growth of original peculiarities in woman, and is perfectly normal, it deserves unqualified commendation. If God has distinguished sister from brother, by giving her a keener sense and relish for the beautiful, a finer taste in displaying, or a greater skill in augmenting it, these mental characteristics are to be recognized as the gift of Supreme Wisdom, and turned to good account in social life. Refinement should

be wedded to virtue ; good taste should weave the robes of piety. Christianity exalts and purifies the faculties of our nature ; she invites all the charities, amenities and graces to follow in her train. Her glory is then most peerless when it is reflected by all things lovely and of good report. This was understood by the apostles. They pronounce no benediction upon soiled garments or matted locks. Barefooted friars and black-veiled nuns are the offspring of a later age. Nor does it appear that Christian females, at first, chose any peculiarities of dress. They may have been distinguished by the modesty and simplicity of their attire, but not otherwise. We are authorized with this restriction to say, that wherever they resided, they freely appropriated the costume used in that place by persons of their own sex. It was not their wish to attract notice either by the meanness, or the oddity, or the splendor of their dress.

But ere long, false notions began to prevail in the Church. A legal spirit took possession of many. It was thought best to discipline the soul more sternly. Pride was assailed from without, and mortified by a garment of rags. Appetite was put to coarser fare, and starved into submission. Avarice was expelled, *vi et armis*, by alienating whole estates in a day. All natural affections were looked upon as traitors to the soul, and were handled with conscientious severity.

The exact point of time when this spirit began to infringe upon the rights of good taste among females, cannot now be ascertained. A few stray leaves alone have floated down from the earliest period of the Church ; and only here and there a word on those faded leaves bears any relation to the subject before us. Many questions, therefore, which curiosity would propose must remain unanswered. Still, but a few generations had passed after the establishment of Christianity, before some undertook to heal the soul by chastising the body. At a later period we read of Christian women who sought, by cruel austerities, to scale the heights of virtue. Chrysostom commends Olympias "for the incredible modesty of her attire, not much better than that of the poorest beggar ;" and speaks of its plainness and simplicity, as

“the bright and beautiful colors of her virtue, whereby that wisdom and divine philosophy which lay hidden in her mind was externally painted and shadowed out.” She possessed great wealth, and belonged to a noble family; yet she not only wore the coarsest garments, but practised watching and fasting till her fragile body was almost destroyed. A similar course was taken by great numbers. Choosing celibacy as holier than marriage, they paid but the minimum of attention to dress, looking upon inelegance, rudeness, and, sometimes, a want of neatness in their apparel, as genuine marks and teachers of humility. Views and conduct so unnatural are the ever-ripening fruits of a blind enthusiasm, which pours oil instead of water upon the flame of pride.

And yet we must confess, that even patristic writings are interspersed with praises of the single life and of coarse apparel. Many passages bear unequivocal testimony in favor of refusing to marry. Many Christian teachers imitated Paul in not taking a wife, but failed to copy his moderation in extolling such a course. In a treatise designed for the use of virgins, Cyprian calls them “the flower of the ecclesiastical plant,” “the beauty and ornament of divine grace,” “a perfect and stainless work,” “the image of God answering to our Lord’s sanctity,” and “the most illustrious part of Christ’s flock.” This is hurtful adulation. Yet we must conclude the good Father, when he wrote these phrases, had in mind an ideal class; for the subsequent chapters of his treatise are a swift witness against the more obvious interpretation. Many virgins, we are made to understand, had laid aside their jewels, but not their vanity. In default of gold and gems, they aimed to attract notice by rude attire and self-conquest. And often since that age have those who would fain become “the observed of all observers,” being inwardly conscious of their peculiar gift, resorted to the same method, and compassed their desire by means of a clownish dress and demeanor.

But on the other hand, some who devoted themselves to a single life, still gratified their love of elegance and society. Cyprian complains that opulent females of this class



asserted a right to be lavish of expense in decorating their persons. He affirms, that by walking abroad in a sumptuous habit, fitted to increase their charms, they attracted the eyes, and drew after them the sighs of young men, enkindled the tinder of desire, and infused the poison of forbidden love; and he warns them against forfeiting their special nearness to Christ by such conduct. To the assertion, that it was proper for them to do as they pleased with their own, he replied:

"True; provided only you do not misuse the blessings of heaven. A voice has been given to man, yet vile and amatory songs are not to be sung. Neither because God has made incense, and wine, and fire, are you bound to sacrifice unto idols. Use your wealth, but for salutary purposes. *Let the poor perceive that you are rich; let the indigent know that you are opulent.*" "Virgins who have put on Christ cannot put on silk and purple; adorning themselves with gold, and pearls, and necklaces, they lose their ornaments of heart and soul."

If any one is prompted by curiosity to survey the whole troop of evils following, at that time, in the train of celibacy, let him read the pages of Cyprian and his fellow teachers in the early Church. The peculiar sanctity ascribed by these very men to such a life multiplied the number, stimulated the vanity and corrupted the virtue of those who made choice of it. Yet, during the first three centuries, only a small minority of Christian females abjured wedlock. Nine-tenths of them, probably, chose to preside in the domestic circle, and perfect the sacred economy of home by their presence. Nor did these, it was thought, in all cases abstain from extravagance in dress. "Very many," says an African Father, "feel the same solicitude in regard to beauty of person and splendor of apparel as before their conversion, and it is impossible to distinguish them by their appearance from the heathen." Especially was this true of Christian women in great cities like Carthage and Alexandria, where luxury spread her softest couch, and vanity put on her costliest robe; where the "finest web of the Indian loom" was coveted more than virtue, and flattery abroad was sweeter to the heart than love at home. In such towns, it was not unusual for the pagan lady to cover her head with a net of woven gold, to load her ears and neck, her

arms and fingers, with sparkling jewels, and to hesitate at no expense in procuring the choicest fabrics for tunic and cloak. A writer whom we have more than once had occasion to quote, uses these graphic and pertinent words :

“By a few small gems a great patrimony is displayed. Forty thousand dollars are strung in pearls on a single thread. Forests and islands are borne off on a slender neck; from a pair of thin ears depends a whole fortune; and the left hand sports away the contents of a full purse on each particular finger. Thus, through the strength of ambition, will one slight form carry about the produce of many estates.”

Another writer compares such a woman to an Egyptian divinity. After describing the groves, porticoes and vestibules of a temple by the Nile, the courts surrounded with pillars, the roofs resplendent with gems and precious stones, and the halls glittering with gold, silver and amber, he observes, that the immediate residence of each god is hidden from view by a veil wrought with curious devices, and adds :

“If now, eager to behold what is most excellent, you seek the idol which inhabits this temple, a priest of grave and venerable aspect, chanting a pæan in the dialect of Egypt, and raising slightly the mysterious veil, will afford you cause for boundless laughter at his divinity; for you will not discover within such a god as you made haste to see, but a weasel, or crocodile, or serpent, or some other wild beast fitted to dwell in the gloomy cavern, or deep pit, or muddy fen, but wholly unworthy of this gorgeous temple. Yet like to such a divinity do those golden ladies appear, who busy themselves in curling their locks, painting their cheeks, staining their eye-lids, coloring their hair, and ornamenting this veil of flesh by the practice of any other soft art, in order, by imitating the Egyptians, to attract unhappy lovers. Bestowing little care upon house or family, they empty their husbands' purses for the materials of seeming beauty, that many eyes may follow them. All day long they are employed at the toilet, and then at evening they glide forth to shine in the lamp-light; for intoxication and partial obscurity add a finish to their meretricious coating of charms.”

It is not surprising that men of genuine piety, lifted above the world by a sublime faith, and supported by the prospect of an eternal weight of glory, were moved to denounce all this with severity, as unbecoming to the followers of Christ. They felt—as every earnest believer must feel—that fashionable display does not spring from true lowliness and purity. They heard the plea, that religion is of the heart, and may be cherished there in secret before God, though it is not paraded in the eyes of men. Against

this fallacy and pretence they were called to level argument and remonstrance, and even satire.

"Goodness," says Tertullian, "at all events true and complete goodness, loves not darkness, but rejoices in the light. It is not enough that Christian morality should *be*, it must be *seen*. For so great ought to be its fulness, that it should flow over from the mind into the manners, and rise up from the conscience into the countenance, and look upon public life as on its own household furniture, and so be serviceable to preserve the faith forever." He therefore urges females "to clothe themselves with the silks of honesty, the fine vestures of piety, the purple of modesty; and being thus beautified and adorned," he proceeds, "God Himself will be your lover."

At a later period, Gregory Nazianzen thus describes his excellent sister, and thereby protests against an opposite course of action :

"She used no gold to make her fine, no yellow hair arranged in knots and curls, nor any other tricks to adorn her head; no loose and transparent garments; no lustre of stones and jewels, enlightening the air round about, and reflecting splendor on those who wear them; no devices and arts of painting; no affectation of purchased beauty, no counter-working of God's creation, dishonoring, reproaching, covering the product of His skill with false and deceitful colors, suffering a spurious and artificial beauty to steal away that natural image, which ought to be kept entire to God and the future state. All this was far from Gorgonia. And though she very well understood the several modes and garbs of female bravery, she thought none so honorable as the manner of her life, and that inward brightness which was lodged in her mind."

The Christian Fathers were especially indignant at the use of anything which changed one's natural appearance. They deemed such conduct disrespectful to man's Creator. Grey hairs, they believed, were as suitable for the aged as raven locks for the young. One of them writes :

"Those who anoint their flesh with cosmetics, soil their cheeks with rouge, or stain their eye-brows with pigment, sin against God. They dislike the work of God, and reproach the Maker of all things. For surely they find fault with Him when they amend His handiwork or add anything thereto. But," he proceeds, "I perceive certain females turning their locks yellow, because they are ashamed of their own nation, and blush that they were not born Germans or Gauls: and so they change their native land with the color of their hair. And some who have lived to old age undertake to make that which is white, black; in obvious contravention of the words of Christ: '*Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black.*' Far be this folly from the daughters of wisdom! In reality, the more carefully old age is concealed, the more plainly it is revealed."

These ancient doctors of the Church proceeded still fur-



ther in their veneration for nature. More than one of them protests against the use of colored garments. Clement of Alexandria denominates the faithful a "snow white flock," and extols white raiment as eminently befitting those who are required to be "pure in heart," and "harmless as doves." Cyprian pleads for the same, and adds the following in support of his views, "God has not made sheep either crimson or purple, nor has He taught us to dye and color their wool by means of shell-fish or the juice of herbs." It will be recollected that after baptism all the candidates wore white apparel for a short time. The Fathers to whom I have referred, would fain have persuaded Christians to wear such robes through life; but their counsel appears to have been disregarded. Indeed, we have no little reason to suspect they sometimes weakened the force of their appeals by a stern and fanatical opposition to every thing attractive. Tertullian writes:

"You should not merely shun all artificial and elaborate beauty, but also *diminish* that which is *natural* by *concealment* and *neglect*. For although beauty is not to be accused when considered as symmetry of the body, as an adjunct to the work of God, as a certain graceful garment for the soul; still it is to be feared rather than coveted; for it led even Abraham to falsehood."

There is, no doubt, a portion of truth in this language; yet the main drift of it is adverse to reason and nature. Beauty of form and of countenance is no less a gift from God than strength of intellect or quickness of sensibility; and whoever associates an assault upon this with legitimate warfare against real evil, diminishes thereby his prospect of success.

After what has now been said, it will be necessary for us to bear in mind, that most Christian females during the first three centuries dwelt neither in marble palaces nor silent cloisters; were neither guilty of extravagance in dress, on the one hand, nor of violating the first principles of good taste, on the other. Extremes fix the attention, and call forth praise or blame; while those who walk the "golden mean," and form the body and staple of every society, pass quietly along, doing the work of life, and then sinking to rest. Such, doubtless, were the great majority of women in

the primitive Church ; modest, frugal, hospitable, and far more intelligent than their pagan sisters.

---

ART. II.—PRACTICAL VIEW OF THE SABBATH.

*"A Mother's Plea for the Sabbath."* By LUCY K. WELLS.  
Portland : William Hyde.

*"Heaven's Antidote to the Curse of Labor."* By JOHN ALLAN QUINTON. New-York : Edward Fletcher.

*"Pearl of Days," "Laborer's Daughter."* Presbyterian Board of Publication.

*"Sabbath Manual."* JUSTIN EDWARDS, D.D. American Tract Society.

*"House of God."* W. W. EVERTS. New-York : Sheldon, Blakeman & Co.

THE first of the volumes above enumerated, is composed of a series of letters from a mother to an absent son, on the value and due observance of the Sabbath, illustrated by striking testimonies, and narratives of fact and incident. The second and third of the list were selected for publication as prize essays, from more than a thousand competing manuscripts. They were written by laborers, to illustrate the importance of the Sabbath, particularly to the industrial classes. They are an earnest, fraternal appeal to brothers for the rights of brothers. Along with high literary excellence, they are characterized by a pertinence of illustration and a pointedness of application which greatly enliven the interest of their perusal. The fourth volume named is a compilation of facts and arguments, illustrating the various social, moral and religious advantages of the Sabbath. It is an embodiment of the word of God as uttered in Scripture and human experience. The "House of God" commends public worship as the true means of preserving and hallowing the Sabbath among all classes. As-

suming that a seventh day will be spared from industrial pursuits, it proposes the only adequate means of consecrating that day to its appointed religious use. Without the house of God we can have no day of God. If the sanctuary is neglected, the Sabbath will be desecrated. Without attempting any particular analysis, or entering upon a discussion of the comparative merits of the works thus briefly described, we proceed to offer a few thoughts upon the practical value of the Sabbath.

The Sabbatical rest was instituted at the creation of man. The antecedent history of the earth has been distinguished by science into six periods or days, over which ruled the blind forces of unorganized and organized matter. The creation of man inaugurated a new period or day—a reign of reason over brute force. Thought then rose to heaven, and earth attained fellowship with the spiritual world. The period of human history and redemption is the seventh day. With the creation of man, the order of terrestrial creation ceased. God rested from the works belonging to this economy, and earth entered upon its “Sabbath,” radiant with rational history, and the progressive illumination of the advancing scheme of redemption. As a symbol and commemoration of this order of creation, and a provision for the necessities of the race, solstitial days were distributed into weeks, and six of them awarded to labor, and the seventh to rest. As God consecrated the seventh period of time, by the intellectual and moral occupation of the earth, so He set apart and hallowed for man’s religious observance the seventh solstitial day. “Wherefore God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.”—Exodus, xx: 12. There is a recognition of this primitive distribution of time, and observance of the seventh day, in the early religious sacrifices of mankind. It was in “process of time,” at this “cutting off” of days, or determined period, that Cain and Abel brought their offerings to the Lord.

In framing the Decalogue, that grand summary of human duty, the law of the Sabbath was incorporated with the primeval laws of God. “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days *shalt* thou labor and do all thy



work ; but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God ; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy so , nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.—Exodus, xx : 8. And through all periods of Jewish history the claims of the Sabbath were insisted upon, as in its due observance conserving true religion and general prosperity, or in its neglect insidiously introducing idolatry, and precipitating national decline. “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words—then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord ; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father ; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”—Isaiah, lviii : 13, 14.

The law of the Sabbath, with other primitive traditionary revelations of God, was less observed among nations apostatizing into idolatry. But traces of this institution are not wanting in all ancient nations. Hesiod, who lived nine hundred years before Christ, giving utterance to the universal tradition, says : “The seventh day is holy.” Theophilus, the philosopher and historian of Antioch, referring to the universality of its observance, says : “The day which all mankind celebrate.” Porphyry says : “The Phœnicians consecrated one day in seven as holy.”

Eusebius observes : “Almost all the philosophers and poets acknowledge the seventh day as holy.” Josephus declares : “No city of Greeks or Barbarians can be found which does not acknowledge a seventh day’s rest from labor.” And Philo testifies : “The seventh day is a festival to all nations.”

Thus through a long course of ages, and among nations not likely to borrow any mere Jewish law, the rest of the Sabbath was more or less strictly observed, showing that it was an institution for man universally,—man in all ages and countries. It is no modern innovation ; no exaction of a despotic priesthood ; no exploded rite of Judaism. It is a

law enacted in Paradise, founded in the constitution of man, and of permanent and universal obligation. It is established, like the order of nature, irreversible, and bearing up the whole structure and economy of society, moral and religious.

The reasons alleged for changing the time of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, we can barely allude to, as they do not fall within the scope of our present purpose. It is urged that the great point of the original law was to fix the amount of time following the allotted period of labor; that the simultaneous observance of the Sabbath is clearly impossible, midnight in China coinciding with midday in America, and proportioned variations extending over the whole longitudinal measurement of the earth; that one traveling East round the globe in the regular observance of his Sabbath, upon reaching home would have gained a day, and have a different Sabbath from his neighbors; while one traveling West, in the same manner, would have lost a day, and be compelled to dissent from the popular Sabbath; that the new creation by Christ, being the spiritual efflorescence of the material order of nature, may properly take precedence of it, and determine the time of the world's Sabbath; that after his resurrection, Christ did once and again honor and sanction the assemblies of his people on the first day of the week; that Paul attended first day assemblies of the disciples, and even postponed an important journey for a whole week, to meet with them in their established order of worship. In commending systematic benevolence, Paul, conforming it to the stated meetings of the churches, bade them lay by their charities on the first day of the week. And as recognizing the peculiar sanctity and privileges of the established religious rest, it is said John was "in the Spirit on the Lord's day." From these reasons, allusions and precedents, the first day, throughout the Christian world, has superseded the seventh as the Sabbatical rest.

We claim, however, the support of the advocates of the seventh and first days alike, while we confine ourselves to the point conceded by both, the obligation and sacredness

of a Sabbatical rest. Commending the general law of a religious rest as enjoined in Paradise, re-published by Moses, guarded by the prophets, and along with the moral code of the decalogue recognized and sanctioned by the greatest and last Lawgiver of the race, we proceed to trace its physical, intellectual and religious advantages.

First—its physical benefits. These are comprised chiefly in its provisions for statedly recurring repose. The value of this repose to physical well-being may be illustrated from the importance of the nocturnal rest. “Quenching the glare of day, and gathering the curtains of darkness round the wearied world, our heavenly Father infolds his children under the shadow of his wings, and hushes them to slumber upon their beds of repose.” Cares are banished from the mind, and weariness removed from the limbs; vigor is restored to the body, tone to the nerves, clearness to the judgment, and peace to the heart.

When through sickness, or watching over the sick, or stress of care, this rest is lost, how soon follow nervous irritability and prostration, bodily weakness, and sometimes death. Experience shows that even the nightly repose, with its occasional interruption, and especially in advancing life, or after sickness, or over-exertion, or vicious excesses have taxed the vital powers, is not adequate to the necessary recuperation of the powers of body and mind. It shows that if labor be continued, in field and counting-house, shop and factory, on the land and on the sea, through all the seven days, and through succeeding weeks and years, the human constitution breaks down beneath its continued burdens, the nerves give way in their unceasing tension, and the mind, in ceaseless occupation, becomes confused, and sometimes wanders in insanity. “Let the hands be ever working, the fingers ever playing, the brow forever sweating, the brain forever throbbing, the feet forever plodding, the shoulders forever drooping, and the loins forever aching, in unremitted toil, and humanity, through all departments of industrial pursuit, would cry out with the yearning and importunate voice of necessity, ‘Rest, rest, rest, or the repose of the grave.’”



And if supplementary provision for rest were not allowed, the race would every where physically sink beneath its burdens, and degenerate to feebler strength and shorter life. Even with the two-fold nocturnal and Sabbatical rest, see how the race in many parts becomes deformed, stolid, and almost insensate. Look at the Sudras of India, the serfs of Russia, and laborers in mining and manufacturing districts of England, and also, in some cases, in the factories and on the plantations of America, to see the debasing and deforming effects of excessive and unduly protracted labor. Now the Sabbath raises a barrier against similar tendencies in all the laboring classes. It lifts the galling yoke of labor from the tired and chafed neck of man. It unchains him from the post of toil. It allows him to stretch his tired limbs in a repose not to be disturbed by factory bell, or steamboat whistle, or angry word of master or overseer. It provides compensating influences to restore the wearied body and mind. It enables the body to rise erect, the limbs to regain the elasticity insidiously lost, the spirits the hopeful tone gradually failing. While important to all mankind, under the law of various employment, the Sabbath is a more indispensable boon to dependent laborers. Masters of business, professional men, merchants, capitalists, statesmen and other classes, when overtaxed by prolonged exertions in a political campaign, a crisis of commerce, or a prevailing epidemic, may command a few days or weeks of leisure, may visit friends, fish or sport, travel at home or abroad, and thus recuperate their powers. But dependent laborers, who more deeply need such recreations, from the greater steadiness and longer continuance of their toils, could command no such intervals of recreation without the Sabbath. They would be ever moving on the treadmill of toil. They would be kept whirling on the great wheel of employment, till, in its rapid cycles, it precipitated them into the abyss of death.

The frequency and length of the Sabbatical rest also exhibit Divine wisdom. It does not occur so often, nor continue so long, as to unsettle the habits of industry, or unnecessarily extend facilities for dissipation and vice. Nor is it so infrequent as to allow the protracted toils and bur-

dens of life to break the elastic springs of health and industry, and keep laborers prone to the dust. Thus providing for the necessary repose and recuperation of man, the Sabbath is like a great compensating reservoir, in those lands where the dry season extends through a large portion of the year. After the springs are dried up, the rills and small streams have ceased to flow, the few remaining rivers have sunk to narrow channels and a sluggish current, the whole land is parched, and the wheels of factories are stopped, this reservoir replenishes the channels which irrigate broad fields, and conserve and ripen the harvests of a province, or the stream that turns the wheels of factories, and thus sustains the industrial economy of a large district. Thus, when the energies and spirits of individuals and communities have been drained off by the exacting toils of the week, the Sabbath replenishes again the springs and channels of health, contentment and happiness.

The Sabbath is a savings bank of health, and physical resources, and powers of achievement. Those who make their weekly deposits in this bank, will have capital increased by interest, available in the emergencies of overtaxing labor, great endeavor, or sickness in later life. He who lives up to his income, will also often mortgage his patrimony, and at the maturity of the mortgage will fail in hopeless bankruptcy. The Sabbath sustains the reserved forces of the constitution. A well provisioned army has a body of reserve. Often that force has plucked victory from the jaws of defeat, saved a campaign, a city, or a kingdom. So in the conflicts of life, a well disposed force of health and constitution may save and prolong life, fortune or usefulness.

Another great advantage of the weekly rest, is its ministration to the intellectual development and cultivation of society. We should not take account of any class of men merely as working animals, and estimate their value only from the strength of their arms, the breadth of their shoulders, the hardness of their muscles, and the insensibility of their nerves. Man may never innocently be reduced to a mere operative, a human machine. However lowly his con-

dition, or rough his exterior, there is traceable in his being the germ of reason and immortality. Any industrial economy ignoring this spiritual nature is a formidable oppression. The recurrence of the Sabbath, both indirectly and directly promotes the culture of this nature. The rest and liberty brought by it impart intellectual impulse, awaken thought, and lead to conclusions from reason and experience. The ablutions which usher in the weekly Sabbath foster self-respect and refined taste, and dispose to ennobling pursuits. The weekly cleansing of person, dress and cottage, contributes not only to the contentment and happiness, but to the intellectual elevation of the laboring classes.

By providing and guarding a portion of time for the uses of the spiritual nature, the Sabbath more directly ministers to the mental improvement of the race. It is often said, as denoting a fair complement for general education, that a child, from its earliest years to manhood, has been allowed two or three months annually for education. And many have succeeded well in life with a less period. But by the provision of the Sabbath, almost two months annually are guaranteed to every individual through life for the high purposes of spiritual discipline. Special courses of education are provided for in colleges or universities, embracing four or six years. . And a period of eight or ten years is deemed sufficient for educating one in all the more important branches of human learning. But by the provision of the Sabbath, every one living the allotted period of life, enjoys ten years sacredly and exclusively devoted to the higher attainments of education.

In the pursuit of mental discipline, a plan of studies with text-books is determined, to insure the greatest progress and the most symmetrical development of the faculties. Thus an approximation to the best system of education is attempted in all countries and communities. Special courses are always allowed, as supplementary to our common school and collegiate systems.

Now the Scriptures, the Divinely appointed text-book for human education, open the precise range of studies best



adapted to all men, of all ages and conditions. There may be supplementary courses of philosophy, languages, or general literature. But this is the wisely adapted course for the necessary universal education of the masses.

“Not to know at large, of things remote  
From common use, and subtle,  
But things which before us lie  
In daily use, is the prime wisdom.”

And this is the cultivation and learning provided for by the Sabbath and the Bible. They are to the race, in their comparative importance, what reading, writing and numbers are to geological or astronomical investigations. They teach men how to live, how to gain the advantages and avoid the ills of life. They teach us how to perform our duties, that we may honor God, serve our generation, and prepare for the rewards of heaven. All other education, beyond the range of these objects, is of much less importance, and may be provided for, to a greater or less extent, as individuals and communities are able. But this course of education is a necessity for all. Those who worthily avail themselves of it are wiser than the unbelieving philosophers or sages of the world. “I am wiser than the ancients, because I understand thy law.”

In any system of education, a certain decorum and serious devotion to study are necessary to success. Wayward children might prefer at all times the license of the playground. But individual and social education can never be carried on without a rigid system, stern requirements, and suitable sanctions. The sacred order of the Sabbath supplies the exact decorum, rigid system, and important sanctions requisite to the most successful education of the race. Let gaiety and amusement prevail during the week. But let seriousness and attention be demanded during the hours of the Divine instruction of the children of men. The sanctity of the Sabbath is no more than the decorum proper in pursuing our highest knowledge. It is the just order and system of the school-room. It is no more to be complained of than the decorum of private or public schools, restlessly endured by wayward and inconsiderate scholars.

If in the symmetrical development of our higher spiritual nature, there is a time to be serious as well as to be gay, to think as well as to act, to contemplate the spiritual and the future, as well as the material and the present, the Sabbath furnishes that time, and shuts out from its sacred hours and assemblies the levities and frivolities of the play-ground.

That this serious *regime* is essential to attain its higher educational effect upon the race, may be seen from individual and national examples. The material and stamina of intellect, worn out from generation to generation, in the higher walks of philosophy, literature and arts, from the neglect of the laws of health, are constantly supplied from the laboring classes of society. The original thinkers, social regenerators, pioneers of liberty, the leaders in art, letters and philosophy are perpetually emerging from the laboring classes, and rising from plebeian rank to the aristocracy of genius, intellect, science and wisdom. Thus Newton, Fergusson, Bowditch, Foster, Carey, and hosts in every department of human enterprise, achievement and learning, attained intellectual mastery and leadership. But those rising from lower rank have made the serious use of the Sabbath a stepping-stone in their first elevation. Those in lower walks using it as a holiday, have remained and died in obscurity. In like manner communities and nations, overlooking its sacred uses, and appropriating it to gaiety and amusement, have ranked far below Sabbath-keeping lands in widely diffused thought and intelligence, strength of intellect and purpose, sobriety of judgment and practical wisdom, civil and religious liberty. The gay, volatile French, who can keep no Sabbath as a Divine appointment, have remained the dupes of their oppressors. The Scotch, with poorer soil and less natural advantages, develop more strength of reason, stability of character, and power of achievement.

With the Sabbath observed, and its system of popular education carried out, any community or nation will rise in intellectual culture and power, useful knowledge and popular wisdom. Destroy all other special educational institutions, and this remaining in its normal use would replace

them, while its suppression would precipitate mental as well as moral chaos and darkness. Intellect cannot become dwarfed, and man deteriorate in his spiritual nature, with the just use of the Sabbath and the Bible. Important as are colleges, universities, and common schools, the press and universal literature, the Sabbath, as a great educational facility, in its importance outmeasures them all. "It comes to give rest to matter and liberty to mind. While it soothes the senses, it unleashes the spirit from its tether. It withdraws the hands from gold gathering, that it may feed and feast the intellect with knowledge. It disinters the soul from the rubbish of earthly cares, and plumes it for higher converse and loftier studies." In Great Britain, more than forty thousand buildings—schools of popular instruction—are opened every Lord's day to the people. More than forty thousand teachers on that day are dispensing knowledge to the masses. The Sabbath school on that day convenes several millions of children, taught by more than half a million of teachers, training the rising generation to virtuous habits, and pointing them to the most important subjects of thought. Its plan of studies has been wisely determined, its teachers carefully selected. Preserve to society this Scriptural Sabbath with its varied uses, and mind shall no where be dwarfed, knowledge no where restricted. Give us the Scriptural Sabbath, and we shall have a free pulpit, a free press, free thought, and free government.

But the greatest benefit of the Sabbath is traced in its provisions for the religious improvement of society. The instinct, or intuition, of religion is universal. It contemplates more important relations and interests than those embraced by this world. It is fostered by a sense of dependence, by contemplation of beauty and grandeur in nature, by the oft-repeated lesson of an overruling Providence, that there is a "Divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we will." Especially is it fostered by the import and order of succeeding revelations, closing with the advent and mission of the Divine Redeemer, "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person."



But left without designated periods of devout contemplation, the cares of the world steal upon the appointments, benumb the conscience, and bribe the vigilance of religion. But for the barriers raised by religious days and services, the world would encroach upon the duties, and desecrate the altars of piety. The Sabbath embodies and commends the whole authority and sacredness of religion. It is the appointed scope of its institutional development. It commends a test to reverence and obedience. It is a stated and formal declaration of the being of God, of a spiritual world, and a moral government. It is a formal repudiation of atheism, idolatry, and all the bold systems of infidelity. It localizes the temple of God in every place. It shows men that neither in Jerusalem, nor Samaria, nor Mecca, nor in any other restricted locality alone can God be worshipped. It invests every place with the obligations, sanctions and facilities of Divine worship. It rings the great bell of the universe, that the sons of earth may every where pause in the race of industry and worldly pursuits, and assemble in religious congregations. It is as if the voice of an archangel followed the light of the morning round the world, summoning man to suspend his week-day labor, and think of God and heaven. All the lower uses of the Sabbath are but stepping-stones to this higher purpose. The cessation from labor, with its leisure, change of attire, and awakened thoughtfulness, may prepare for religious homage. All thoughts and studies of nature may open avenues of approach to God. The enlarged opportunity for retirement and meditation, domestic fellowship and discipline, and for public instruction and social worship, may aid the soul in heavenly attainment. Religion quickened into action and aspiration, wells up in private and public virtues. It elevates the happiness and charities of society. It is the bond of individual virtue, family order, civil government, and universal society.

The Sabbath gives utterance to all the appeals of virtue, all the protests against injustice and vice. It is a day of confession, forgiveness and peace to the world. The Sabbath ushers in and breathes peace over the world, and dif-

fuses its influence to the homes and bosoms of all. From the spire of every Christian chapel waves a flag of truce to earthly strifes and warring passions; from its pulpits is proclaimed an amnesty to contending parties and hostile feuds; and from its worship are ever going forth influences to quicken, extend, and preserve the sympathies and fellowship of the human brotherhood.

In the formality and sanctions of an ever recurring observance, God addresses the world, as Moses, from the burning bush, the prophet, in the still voice from the mountain, and the tribes of Israel, before the trembling and blazing mount. The more directly it confounds the race in their march or rush of worldliness, and crosses their lawless pursuits, the more sensibly does it press home the conviction of the importance of the spiritual world, and the obligations of Divine law.

The Sabbatical rest, with its three-fold advantage to the physical well-being, intellectual development, and religious improvement of our race, is secured to the undisturbed enjoyment of mankind only by the authority and sanctions of its Divine appointment. In all ages the most important rights of men have been sought to be wrested from them, and have been proximately retained in some ages and parts of the world only by royal oaths, covenants, political compacts and charters. With all these expedients and solemn engagements, how few of the race have won or retained even a moiety of their great rights. A few, indeed, by ceaseless vigilance, in appealing to constitutions, compacts, charters and ancient traditions, have retained their rights. Thus only has the great and pregnant right of a Sabbath been maintained by some, while lost, or divested of its immunities, to most of the world. Pleading for it as a great primary and inalienable right, like the right to liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness, which avarice may not buy up, selfishness may not add to its domain, commerce, manufactures and agriculture may not appropriate to their pursuits, nor sensuality turn into a festal day of passion and dissipation, it may be retained. But the high authority of its appointment, and its religious sanctions overlooked, it

will be gradually wrested from any people. In France, it is observed as an ecclesiastical day of secondary importance; and in Paris no laborer scrupulous about keeping the Sabbath is sure of employment. In Scotland, the Sabbath is based upon its Divine appointment, and guarded by its religious sanctions, and no laborer is asked to sacrifice his rest, the fellowship of his family, and his religious duties, to any secular calling. It is its Divine appointment that conserves all its lower as well as its higher uses. And those who would keep it as an heir-loom in the family, a wholesome order in the State, must plead its high sanctions and honor its holy usages. The world will not dare follow the laborer into the temple of God, and drag him from the altar to do its bidding.

Will not all, and especially dependent laborers, stand before their employers and the world upon their reserved and inalienable rights? Any surrender of them is of no ultimate advantage to them, even pecuniarily, while they betray all their fellow-laborers, and bring the frown of heaven upon themselves and their brethren. In the end, men get no more for seven than for six days of toil. The laborers of a country fix the prices of labor, and, if intelligent and acting in concert, they may gain just terms and adequate remuneration. Their competition with each other in Sabbath work is suicidal to themselves, renders labor subservient, and incurs the guilt of sacrilege and growing irreligion. Let laborers unite in protesting against these encroachments upon their rights. A conductor on a railroad, solicited to extend his service over a part of the Sabbath, declined, and retained his place and the respect of his employers. Let all the operatives on railroads awake to a sense of their rights, true interests and sacred duties, and they can lead railroad companies to do justice to their employees, honor the religion, and promote the virtue and happiness of their country, and obey God. This end has been partially gained on some of our best roads; let it be gained on all. They would have nearly the same travel, and all the business of the seven in the six days.

So in the vast steamboating interest on our rivers, and the



shipping at our ports. Commerce should stand still on the Sabbath. The expense could be endured, as the expense of all providential delays. How does the steamboat interest endure the obstruction of business from low water and from ice? Sometimes boats may run eight, six, or only four or two months a year. If these inequalities and uncertain losses can be borne, could not the regular and computable delay of a weekly Sabbath be endured? Would not the supposed pecuniary loss be assessed upon the business community, without lessening the profits of the carrying trade? Recently, the boatmen of New-Orleans petitioned that their business might be suspended on the Sabbath. Let all boatmen on all our rivers join in the petition, and redeem the Sabbath from its desecration, and themselves from the slavery and abjectness of their condition. Let telegraph operators, clerks, barbers and all other laborers, join in seeking a repeal of the law of Sabbath desecration, and unitedly observe the day of rest. Let the hum of factories, the ring of hammers, and the whistle of steam engines cease. Let the plough stop in the furrow, the tool lie upon the bench, and the business of commerce and the professions cease. It has been shown by the most varied and ample experience, that Sabbath-breaking is a loss to society in every way. Domestic animals will do more and work longer with the Sabbath rest. Flocks and herds can be driven long distances to market in better condition by keeping the Sabbath. Stage and team horses do not wear out so soon in keeping the Sabbath.

An infidel, boasting in a published letter that he had raised two acres of "Sunday corn," which he intended to devote to the purchase of infidel books, adds: "All the work done on it was done on Sunday, and it will yield some seventy bushels to the acre, so I don't see that but Nature or Providence has smiled upon my Sunday work, however the priests or the Bible may say that work done on that day never prospers. My corn tells another story." To this the editor of an agricultural paper replies: "If the author of this shallow nonsense had read the Bible half as much as he has the works of its opponents, he would have known that the great Ruler of the universe does not always square up his accounts with mankind in the month of October."

Bankers, professional men and statesmen retain longer their health and the use of their faculties by keeping the Sabbath. Without the rest of that day many become con-

fused and uncertain in their calculations, less able in their intellectual efforts, less safe in their plans and expedients, and die early of mental or nervous exhaustion, or become hopelessly insane. Sir Matthew Hale and Wilberforce, examples of prolonged industry and prodigious achievement, attribute their energy to the sacred observance of the Sabbath. Shipping and other merchants testify that in any of our large cities, other things being equal, those of moral tone and Sabbath-keeping habits have more generally survived commercial crises, and retained health, credit and fortune.

Will not, then, masters of business, merchants, directors of corporations, and citizens generally join in an effort to promote the more worthy observance of the Lord's day? Let all waive the service and luxuries which deprive laborers of the due use of the Sabbath. And where sacrifice is involved, the example will be more effective. The elder Adams, when President of the United States, returning from an excursion north of Boston, was storm-bound at Andover, twenty miles from home, where he learned that his family were waiting his return, with one of the number sick. Sunday morning the roads for the first time became passable, and his friends, and even the clergyman, thought the occasion might justify traveling on the Sabbath. But the President, observing that—as few would know the stress of the occasion—his example would be pernicious, left his family in the care of Providence, while he honored one of its most obligatory and beneficial institutions. And the younger Adams, while minister to a foreign court, once and again was absent from the diplomatic circle appointed on the Lord's day, and gave as his reason, that he could not so far disregard his own principles and those of his country as to turn the Sabbath to secular use, at the behest of any civil authority or fashionable etiquette. Let all our men of high standing and extensive influence follow these noble examples, and it will go very far to restore the Sabbath to its rightful position, and to secure to our country the inestimable benefits resulting from the due observance of this sacred day.

## ART. III.—THE DEVIL AND HIS ANGELS.

THE Scriptures speak of an order of beings who are called, "The angels that sinned," and, "The angels that kept not their first estate," and who are described as "Principalities and powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, wicked spirits (marginal reading) in high places." These beings appear to have a leader, who is represented as a personal existence, and who is always spoken of in the singular number. In this article we shall inquire what the Scriptures teach concerning him and them. It is a subject respecting which many vague notions have been held. While some have attributed undue importance to the power and influence of evil spirits, and have been the subject of extravagant fears respecting them, others have gone to the opposite extreme, and have altogether denied their existence, asserting that evil is to be found only in man, and has no personal subsistence. We inquire, then, "What saith the Scriptures" on this subject? And our inquiry must be confined to the Scriptures, because as spirits these beings are not cognizable by our senses; while their suggestions to our minds are so intimately connected with our own thoughts, that it is difficult for us to decide whether the suggestions to evil of which we are conscious come from within or without, from our own evil inclinations, or from external beings seeking to seduce us to sin.

Our first inquiry has reference to Satan himself, standing as he does in the foreground of the Bible's statements on this subject.

I. We direct attention, first, to some of the personal acts ascribed to him, which prove his individuality. We might speak here of the temptation of Eve, but as the statement in Genesis is, that *the serpent* beguiled her,—the Devil not being in express terms mentioned in connection with that temptation,—although there is no doubt in the mind of the writer as to the direct agency of the Devil therein, he pre-



fers to take other instances less likely to be disputed. Take the case of Job. Satan is represented as accusing and calumniating Job by insinuating (chap. i: 9, 10,) that the service wherewith he served God was interested in its character, being only connected with his worldly prosperity, and would cease as soon as that prosperity was withdrawn: and when Job had safely passed this test, Satan boldly declared (chap. ii: 4, 5,) that if Job were personally afflicted, he would curse God to his face. Satan is still further described (chap. i: 12, 19,) as putting agencies in operation by which Job was deprived of his oxen, asses, sheep, camels, servants and children; and by which the house where the children were assembled was blown down; and it is stated still further, (chap. ii: 7,) that *he* "smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown." Each of these acts requires individual and intelligent existence, and proves that Satan is a *being*, and not the mere *personification* of evil in man, as some would have us believe.

We have another illustration in the temptation of Jesus Christ. This is narrated at length by Matthew (chapter iv: 1, 11,) and Luke, (chapter iv: 1, 13,) both evangelists giving a statement of the same facts in connection therewith. They relate that the Devil *came* to Christ, that he *took him* to a pinnacle of the temple, and to a high mountain, that he made promises of temporal good if Jesus would *worship him*, and that he *departed* from him. Now this Devil could not have been the personification of evil in Christ, because it is affirmed of him, that "He did no sin;" (1 Peter, chap. ii: 22,) "He knew no sin;" (2 Corinthians, chap. v: 21,) and although he "was in all points tempted like as we are," he was "yet without sin."—(Hebrews, chap. iv: 25.) Yea, he could triumphantly inquire of his enemies: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?"—(John, chap. viii: 46.) Besides, all the acts we have spoken of in connection with this temptation indicate a separate personality, an external being, performing deeds himself, and suggesting to Jesus that he should do certain things.

Again we find him instigating Judas to betray Christ.

First, he put it *into* his heart to do this, (John, chap. xiii: 2,) therefore it was not merely the evil disposition of Judas which suggested this line of conduct to him, since the text expressly speaks of an influence being exerted from without. Next he *entered into* him, (Luke, chap. xxii: 3; John, chap. xiii: 37,) thus adopting a further means of accomplishing his diabolical purpose, and by this act proving himself a person external to Judas Iscariot, and yet not a human being, but a spirit, who entering *into* him, could approach his mind directly, instead of being obliged to do so through the medium of the senses.

Other acts are ascribed to him, which also distinctly prove his personality. He is spoken of as a father. (John, chap. viii: 44,)—"Ye are of your father the Devil." (Acts, chap. xiii: 10,)—"Thou child of the Devil." (1 John, chap. iii: 8,)—"The children of the Devil." Yet we cannot suppose it possible that, by any correct figure of speech, an individual can be called "the child of himself," the offspring of a mere principle or disposition within him. Again, he is said to use wiles and snares. The apostle Paul exhorts the Ephesians: (chap. vi: 2) "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil;" and (1 Timothy, chap. iii: 7; 2 Timothy, chap. ii: 26,) he speaks of "the snares of the Devil." Further it is declared (1 Peter, chap. v: 8,) that he, "as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." He has *an imitator*, "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders."—(2 Thessalonians, chap. ii: 9.) Again, when Joshua the high-priest stood before the Lord, (Zechariah, chap. iii: 1,) Satan stood "at his right hand to resist him;" or "to be his adversary:" probably calumniating and accusing him, as in the case of Job. He was contended with by Michael the archangel, (Jude, chap. ix,) disputing "about the body of Moses." He filled the heart of Ananias "to lie to the Holy Ghost," and to "keep back part of the price of the land;" (Acts, chap. v: 3,) and he is represented (Revelation, chap. xx: 2,) as bound for a thousand years, and (verses 7—8) as loosed

out of his prison, and going out to deceive the nations. We remark further, that while many demons—*δαίμονια*—are referred to as subordinate to him, the names Satan and Devil,—*διαβολος*.—as applied to this being of whom we are speaking, are always used in the singular number.\* Do we then need any further proof of his individual personal existence?

II. In pursuing our investigation, we refer to the names by which he is called, noting their significations. He is called Satan, Hebrew—שָׂטָן, Greek—*σατανᾶς*. This is a Hebrew word, which means an adversary or accuser. The first example of his being so called in the Bible is in 1 Chronicles, xxi: 1, where it is stated that he “provoked David to number Israel,” and thus as his adversary induced him to incur the displeasure of God. But the first instance in chronological order is Job, i: 6, where, as we have already seen, he appears as the accuser and calumniator of Job. He is called by this name a number of times, both in the Old and New Testaments, and it strikingly sets forth his character as the *adversary* of both God and man.

The other name by which he is most commonly designated is Devil,—Greek—*διαβόλος*. It is similar to the former term, and means an accuser, calumniator or slander. It is the word by which “Satan” is rendered in the Septuagint, and is the name given him by Jesus Christ, (John, viii: 44,) when he said to the Jews: “Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him.” In this character he tempted Eve, and in it he frequently tempts men to evil, calumniating the character and commands of God, and seek-

---

\*There are but three instances in the New Testament in which *διαβόλος* is used in the plural. In 1 Timothy, chapter iii: 11, and Titus, ii. 3, it is forbidden as an evil to be avoided, and is evidently used in its primary acceptation of “slanderers,” while in 2 Timothy, iii: 3, it is employed prophetically of some in the last days, and is correctly rendered “false accusers.” There is only one instance in which it is used in the singular, except with reference to Satan, viz.: John vi: 70, where Jesus said to his disciples, “Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?”



ing to persuade men that His commands are unreasonable, and that there is greater happiness to be secured by disobeying His laws, than can be obtained by obeying them.

Further, he is called "the Tempter," (Matthew, iv : 3 ; 1 Thessalonians, iii : 5,) because it is one of his leading aims to induce men to sin against God. In Revelation, ix : 11, he is called "Abaddon" and "Apollyon," the former being the Hebrew, and the latter the Greek term for "destroyer." He has this name because it is not only his object to mar and destroy the work of God, but all who yield to his temptations and come under his influence, unless saved by the grace of God, are exposed to certain and eternal destruction ; and as all have sinned, and "are by nature the children of wrath," he is the destroyer of the whole human family ; those only who are made new creatures in Christ Jesus, and receive pardon and eternal life in him, being saved from that destruction.

Again, he is called "the Serpent." This name is given him in Revelation, xx : 2, "That old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan." We think that the same appellation is given him in 2 Corinthians, xi : 3 : "As the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety." This name is applied to him on account of his subtlety and deception, in which he is sometimes "transformed into an angel of light ;" and probably more especially because in the body of this reptile he deceived Eve, and thus introduced evil into our world. In Hebrews, ii : 14, he is spoken of as "Him that had the power of death," probably because it was through his temptation that our first parents sinned, and thus with their posterity became subject to physical, as well as spiritual and eternal death. He is also called "The prince of the power of the air ;" (Ephesians, ii : 2,) "The prince of this world ;" (John, xii : 31,) "Beelzebub the prince of demons ;" (Matthew, xii : 24,) "The wicked one ;" (1 John, ii : 13,) "The great red dragon ;" (Rev. xii : 3,) and "The angel of the bottomless pit."—(Rev. ix : 2.) If any thing were wanting to this end, these various names all go to confirm the fact of his personality, while, at the same time, they serve to illustrate his character.

It is important now that we examine what the Bible teaches respecting the subordinates of this arch-fiend, this "Evil one." In various parts of the New Testament they are called "demons,"—*δαιμόνια*. They are so called in every case in which, in our translation, persons are said to have been possessed with a devil or devils; also in 1 Corinthians, x: 20—21, where the apostle speaks of sacrificing to, and fellowship with devils, and of the cup and table of devils; in 1 Timothy, iv: 1, where he refers to the "doctrine of devils;" and in Revelation, ix: 20, where mention is made of the worship of devils. This name was applied by the heathen to some of their gods, and especially to familiar spirits, and appears to have been used by the Jews to designate fallen angels. We may remark here, that in no case is the word *διαβόλος* employed to denote this class: all of them, whether spoken of in the singular or plural, are *δαιμόνια*. Little as we are disposed to find fault with our present version of the Scriptures, we think it would have tended to greater clearness, if our translators had rendered the two words, *διαβόλος* and *δαιμόνιον*, which are always kept so distinct by the sacred writers, by two different English words, instead of rendering them indiscriminately, and confounding them as they have done by the use of the single word *devil*, thus making no distinction in title between the prince and his subjects.

In Psalm lxxviii: 49, they are called "evil angels," which intimates their opposition to every thing that is good and holy, and especially to God "the Holy One." Jude (verse 6) calls them, "The angels that kept not their first estate;" from which we learn that they were originally in a very different position from that which they now occupy, no doubt possessing the favor of God, and enjoying his smile, instead of enduring his frown. In 2 Peter, ii: 4, they are described as "the angels that sinned;" showing that it was transgression which led to their fall, and placed them in their present condition of alienation from God, and of opposition to him and his works. They are designated "the angels of the Devil," (Matthew, xxv: 41,) and "the angels of the Dragon."—(Revelation, xii: 7.) Now as the term angel

means primarily "a messenger," it follows that these designations point out their position as subordinate to the Devil, and shows their work, which is to aid him in seeking to carry out his diabolical schemes and plans of opposition to the will of Jehovah. In Matthew, xii: 26, the term Satan is applied to them. "If Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself, how shall then his kingdom stand?" This still further confirms the idea just suggested, and intimates that they are so much under his control, that what they do is said to be done by him; and hence, if he were to cast them out of the individuals whom they possessed, he would by this be casting himself out, that is, destroying his own power.

They are a regularly organized body. This seems to be taught in Ephesians, vi: 12, where it is said: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits (marginal reading) in high places." This passage intimates a high degree of organization among these evil spirits. Not only are they under the direction of their prince, the Devil, but there are numerous orders and degrees of them, there are probably chiefs among them who have charge of different departments, and who have their subordinates of different grades, through whom they seek to carry out their plans.

III. Having proceeded thus far in our inquiry into the names and character of "the Devil and his angels," we are prepared to examine into their origin, present condition, employment and destiny. Their origin is closely connected with a subject which has embarrassed the minds of men for many ages, namely, the origin of evil, a subject which we must still be content to leave unsolved. Suffice it to say, that we cannot believe with some that evil, like God, is eternal; nor with others, that sin was created by God. Of "the Devil and his angels" we learn, that like everything else in existence, they are originally the workmanship of God, that like everything else, they came *pure* from the hands of their Creator; but Satan "*abode* not in the truth," (John, viii: 44,) proving that he was once in it; the angels



“kept not their first estate,” (2 Peter, ii: 4,) they sinned, (Jude, 6,) and thus this band of rebels, originally created pure and holy, fell from the position in which God had created them, and from the enjoyment of his favor. We do not know what was the peculiar form of their transgression, but from 1 Timothy, iii: 6, “Not a novice, lest being lifted up with *pride* he fall into the condemnation of the Devil,” it would seem that *pride*, manifested in some way, was the cause of Satan’s fall. The late Dr. Harris\* suggests the probability “that ‘the first estate’ which some of them (the angels) ‘kept not’ may have been passed on this ancient earth.” If this were so, it might in part account for the malignity they manifest towards mankind, but as the Scriptures are silent on this subject, we must be content to leave it undecided.

Their present condition appears to be one of uneasiness and misery, since both Peter and Jude inform us that they are “in chains of darkness,” “reserved unto the judgment of the great day.” We do not understand, however, that they are literally in chains, since Satan is represented as walking about, and “going to and fro in the earth;” and it is intimated that his angels also are at liberty for deeds of evil. We understand by these statements that they are entirely under the power of God, that they cannot escape from his control, and that they are as certainly reserved for future judgment, as the criminal who is chained in a dungeon. They must be unhappy, for they are conscious of the loss they have sustained; they know that the wrath of God is over them, and although in their malignity they are still seeking to mar the work of God, they must be aware that they have often failed in their plans, and that God has often over-ruled their evil devices, and caused them to redound to his glory.

Their *work* has been to a considerable extent set forth in the remarks already made. Satan is emphatically *the adversary of man*.—1 Peter, v: 8. He and his emissaries,

---

\* Sketches of the Doctrines of Angels. Biblical Review, 1849, page 294.

moved by hatred to men, and especially by opposition to God, seek to do all the mischief they can. They have often inflicted physical injury. We have seen this in the case of Job, upon whom Satan inflicted all the evil that was permitted to him. We see it in the case of the demoniacs of the New Testament; for one was blind and dumb, (Matthew, xii: 22,) another was often cast into the fire and into the water; (Matthew, xvii: 15,) and another no man could tame, but he dwelt among the tombs, and was always "crying, and cutting himself with stones."—(Mark, v: 4, 5.) Their malevolence is especially seen in the last case, when, being obliged to leave the man, they asked permission to enter the swine, and having obtained it, rushed with the whole herd of two thousand down a steep place into the sea, where the swine were choked. We have an illustration of the exertion of some such power in the case of the apostle Paul, for in 2 Corinthians, xii: 7, he speaks of "a thorn in the flesh, *the messenger of Satan* to buffet" him, and in 1 Thessalonians, ii: 18, he tells the Thessalonians, "Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but *Satan hindered us*." Again, in Revelation, ii: 10, Jesus Christ says to the church at Smyrna: "Behold the Devil shall cast some of you into prison."

Whether the Devil and his angels have any such power to inflict physical evil now, we know not; but they certainly have access to the minds of men. We know not their means and mode of access, or what are their sources of information respecting the circumstances of men; but they appear to accomplish their object by blinding the eyes of the unconverted. See 2 Corinthians, iv: 3—4: "In whom the *god of this world* hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." And they probably frequently endeavor to prevent a return to better feelings, by presenting before the minds of men the pleasures of sin, and the ease with which they can be secured. They exert an influence even upon the godly, tempting them to actual sin, sometimes even to the commission of flagrant crime, more frequently, however, to what are called "little

sins," "slight deviations" from the path of rectitude. And where there is a tolerable freedom from such temptations, evil thoughts are often suggested to the mind, and cause much distress and annoyance. How often is the Christian troubled in this way. His desire is to do the will of God; he wishes to have his mind fixed on spiritual things, but instead of this, foolish, sceptical, and even blasphemous thoughts come into his mind, and notwithstanding he can truly say, "I hate vain thoughts," they still pursue him. They enter his mind while he is engaged in the services of the sanctuary, and even intrude when he is before the "mercy seat." Was not Bunyan right when he said of Christian: "One of the wicked ones got behind him, and stepped up softly to him, and whisperingly suggested many grievous blasphemies to him, which he verily thought had proceeded from his own mind?" The experience of many a saint is depicted in the following sentence: "This put Christian more to it than any thing that he had met with before, even to think that he should now blaspheme Him that he had loved so much before."

We may sum up the whole matter by saying that, as a rebellious and fallen angel, Satan is in entire and eternal opposition to God, and that his object and aim are to hinder the plans and arrangements of Jehovah, especially those that relate to the salvation of man; that he is aided by the mighty host of fallen ones, whose movements he directs, and who having renounced allegiance to God, yield Satan prompt and ready obedience; that he and they act upon the minds of men, suggesting evil thoughts and desires, seeking to obscure the mind, that it may not understand the truth, and presenting various false motives, which often appear plausible, as inducements to transgression. But in no case can they go beyond the Divine permission; for although they have cast off allegiance to God, they are still under the control and power of the Almighty, who, when he *permits* them to exercise their malevolence, still appoints them their bounds, and forbids their going beyond them.

A few passages of Scripture put us in possession of all we know respecting their *destiny*. They are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the



great day," (Jude, 6,) so that while enduring the frown of Jehovah, whose favor they once possessed, the final sentence is not passed, the day of judgment has not yet arrived. It will probably be the same as the period appointed for judging men,—"*that day*" of which so much is said in the Bible. Again we learn, from Matthew, xxv : 41, that hell, the place of loss and unending woe, is prepared for "the Devil and his angels," and as that loss and ruin are described as "everlasting punishment," it follows that the destiny of the Devil and his angels is "everlasting punishment." This view is supported by Revelation, xx : 10:—"And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

A few additional remarks will close this article. We have wily and dangerous enemies to contend against; enemies who have considerable acquaintance with our circumstances, habits and propensities, who know how to present their temptations in such forms and at such times as are most likely to prove successful. They are organized in such a way as to give them additional power, they come to us when we are not aware of their approach, and have access to our minds in a manner entirely different from that of any earthly foe.

Yet they are neither omniscient, omnipresent nor omnipotent. Some talk as if the Devil possessed these attributes, but he does not possess either of them, for they are the perfections of Jehovah, who alone possesses them. Neither the Devil nor his angels are omniscient. Of this we have abundant proof, for if they knew what would be the result of their temptations, they would not so often take a course which ends in their own defeat. They are not omnipresent, for as creatures they can occupy but one place at one time. They are not omnipotent. They cannot compel any one to sin. Indeed, we err when we attribute *all* temptation to them. Many of our temptations are from ourselves. James says: "But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then when

is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin ; and sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death."—(Jas. i: 14—15.) But even when temptations come direct from the evil ones, they have no power to *compel* us to do wrong. If we "resist the Devil, he will flee from us."

Whatever may be the number, cunning and power of our spiritual enemies, we have a sure refuge from their devices. "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations ;" (2 Peter, ii: 9,) Jesus "suffered, being tempted ;" (Heb. ii: 18,) and the promise to the Church is: "The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly."—(Rom. xvi: 20.)

There is no injustice or unkindness on the part of God in permitting temptation, seeing that none are compelled to yield to its influence ; that God offers his help in every time of need ; that temptations often prove blessings to those who are tried by them, and that they who flee to Christ for salvation are safe ; for he says of his sheep who hear his voice, and follow him: "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall *never perish*, neither *shall any* pluck them out of my hand."

---

#### ART. IV.—RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN VIRGINIA.\*

WE wish, at the very outset, to disclaim what will probably be suggested by the title of this article. It is not our

---

\* Virginia Baptists. By Robert B. Semple. Richmond. 1810.

A Narrative of Events Connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia. By Thomas L. Hawks, Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New-York. New-York. 1836.

Lives of Virginia Baptist Ministers. By James B. Taylor. Richmond. 1838.

A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and other parts of the World. By David Benedict. 1848.

The History of Virginia. By Robert R. Howison. Richmond. 1848.

expectation, by simply raising the cry of *persecution*, to prove, that any denomination which may have been its object, is altogether right, nor, on the other hand, that any which has practised it, must therefore be wrong in all other respects, and worthy of unmeasured denunciation. We acknowledge another and far higher standard of truth and right, to be found in the Holy Scriptures alone. By their light, and by neither the cruelties nor sufferings of sinful men, we must form our estimate of doctrines and practices. While we have our Savior's authority for believing, that the eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam fell, were not the only sinners there, we have that of Paul, his inspired apostle, for believing also, that "giving our bodies to be burned" is "nothing without charity." It is in accordance therefore with neither our taste nor principles, to claim excellence for the denomination whose interests we support, merely because it is "the sect every where spoken against," nor to hurl anathemas against others, simply because they so speak.

We intend to glance at the religious history of one of our leading colonies, with a very different purpose, and in a very different spirit. We hope to find, in the process, additional proof, that civil government is powerless to check the progress of enlightened and ardent religious sentiment, and that a people, distinguished by many illustrious qualities and services, may be betrayed, by carelessness, and that ignorance of religion, which is the parent of bigotry, into tyrannous severities, at which their posterity must blush. The ignorance which led the Virginians into these odious measures, short indeed of death, but revolting to every right-minded man of the present day, was, at the settlement of Jamestown, well nigh common to the civilized world.

In that very year, 1607, Bacon, the brightest intellect of that, perhaps of any age, had at last won the long-coveted

---

*Sketches of Virginia.* By Rev. William H. Foote, D.D., Pastor of Presbyterian Church, Romney, Va. Philadelphia. 1850.

Second Series. Philadelphia. 1855.

*An Address, before the American Baptist Historical Society.* By Robert B. C. Howell, D.D., Pastor of Second Baptist Church, Richmond, Va. Philadelphia. 1857.



post of Solicitor-general, not by his real merit, but by mean solicitation, and cringing to the cowardly and pedantic tyrant, James the First. It is a sad thing to reflect, that the sublime genius, which cast its eagle glance over the whole field of human knowledge, and taught his own and coming ages, how truth was to be discovered in every part of that field, yet could not rise to "the height of the great argument" of religious freedom. In his essays, indeed, he denounces "Mahomet's sword or like unto it; that is to propagate religion by wars, or, by sanguinary persecutions, to force consciences," but adds, "except in cases of overt scandal, blasphemy, or intermixture of practice against the State," and, in another place, "for, as the temporal sword is to be drawn with great circumspection in cases of religion, so it is a thing monstrous to put it into the hands of the common people; let that be left unto the *Anabaptists and other furies*." Not only did Bacon thus advocate the principle of persecution, however qualified, but carried it out himself, at the bidding of James, in a case of aggravated and atrocious tyranny. About the year 1615, a certain Peachum had written, (without preaching or publishing, or intending to preach or publish,) a sermon said to reflect on the King's ministry, then in a sort of interregnum between the infamous Somerset and the rapacious, imperious Buckingham. The base James, at once, set every engine at work, to convict and to destroy a man, who had had the insolence to think justly, and to write what he thought. Lord Bacon, now risen to be Attorney-general, tried to extract a confession from him, by questioning him "before torture, between torture and after torture." His great rival, Lord Coke, who, with all his faults, was "made of sterner stuff" than Bacon, refused to give his opinion of the case before trial, although urged to do so by the King, declaring that he could not "judge in a chamber." We have, however, no evidence, nor is it at all probable, that Coke himself understood and embraced the principles of religious liberty. In this case, he merely acted in the true spirit of his profession, mingled, perchance, with disgust at the pliancy of his illustrious enemy. He afterwards exhibited the

rare spectacle of a man, who, at eighty, resisted tyranny with a boldness and magnanimity, by no means characteristic of his earlier years. The "Quatuor Orabis" in his famous distribution of the twenty-four hours, and the pious calmness with which he is said to have died, indicate that, in common with nearly all the great men of that age, he theoretically, if not practically, gave great prominence to religion; and, as, in his latter years, he mingled freely with the popular party in Parliament, it is possible, that he may have caught a portion of the liberal sentiments about religion, just awaking among some of its leaders. It is certain, that one, said to be his protégé, gave the first example in government, of that sacred principle, the origination of which, now in its hour of triumph, is claimed, with as much eagerness by different communities, as the nativity of Homer by the seven rival cities.

Great as have been the acknowledged services of Virginia in the cause of liberty, and deeply rooted as religious freedom now is in the hearts of her citizens, she unfortunately cannot appear among those claimants. It does not appear, that Sir Walter Raleigh, who named and made several fruitless attempts to settle Virginia, went beyond his age in his ideas of religious liberty, unless indeed the suspicions of his infidelity we have seen insinuated, are well-founded. He certainly did not avow unbelief, zealously defended the Protestant cause on the Continent with tongue and sword, and gave one hundred pounds to propagate Christianity among the Indians, when he transferred his Virginia patent. We fear, indeed, that, with such men as Raleigh and Bacon, religion was a very subordinate consideration, and that any religious toleration granted by them, would have been the result of politic indifference, like that at first allowed by Constantine or by Julian the Apostate, or that left by Henry the Fourth to the French Huguenots, whom he selfishly deserted. The fire of true soul-freedom was struck from the flint of persecution, by a different and far humbler class of men. Like Prometheus of old, they long had "the vulture and the rock" as their portion, for offering this signal blessing to mankind; but a far mightier than Hercules

has, at last, burst their chains, and led them forth from their desert cliff, into a wide field of honor, labor, and benevolence.

The primitive Church were often the victims, of course never the agents, of persecution. It was only when religion was corrupted by an unnatural and adulterous union with the State, that men, professing Christianity and possessing power, were tempted to use the latter to promote the diffusion and preservation of so great a good. The mistake which they made was not unnatural; but the result has signally proved the danger of once departing from true principle: that departure became wider, as time rolled on, until men entirely forgot, what the pages of the New Testament, and the conduct of Christ and his early followers ought to have made clear as noon-day. Our Savior's declaration, that his "kingdom was not of this world," made Pilate feel that he could not execute him as an enemy of the Roman Emperor. At the first view, this may seem only to negative the claim of the Pope and of all ecclesiastics, to civil power; but examined more carefully, it will be found equally to involve the converse. The moment the Church receives aid from any government, Christianity is converted from a spiritual, into a worldly kingdom, relying, *pro tanto*, on material, carnal weapons, for its support and extension. The correctness of this interpretation is fully established by the whole tenor of our Savior's life. From the manger to the grave, he never applied to any king or magistrate to aid in the diffusion of his saving doctrines. When Peter would have defended him with the sword, he referred to the legions not of men, but of angels, that he had at his command. Without dwelling on the crucifixion, which he could have so easily prevented, had it not been essential to his mission, he sought to propitiate neither Jewish Sanhedrim, nor Roman Procurator towards those followers, whose duty he made it to "preach the gospel to every creature." He warned them of the cruel persecution which awaited them from Jew and Pagan, but never hinted, that they must shelter themselves under the ægis of civil power, or seek from it vengeance on their enemies. They were commanded



to go forward, trusting to nothing but "the foolishness of preaching" and "the sword of the Spirit," for spreading their divine gospel. Verily these proved more potent, than the sword of David, and the wisdom of Solomon.

It was only when they had already reduced multitudes under the peaceful sceptre of the gospel, that the crafty and cruel Roman Emperor, bethought him to seize this growing faith, and make it the hand-maid of his policy. The stain, imprinted by his bloody fingers on the spotless robe of Christianity, has not yet been washed out.

Power and splendor soon corrupted the ministry, who became the ready instruments of oppression. As all religions had been national, more especially, it was argued, ought this, so clearly revealed from heaven, to assume that character. It seemed altogether proper to preserve and to spread what they considered of inestimable value to mankind. This soon became the common theory, embraced, no doubt, by many excellent Christians. Some, indeed, like the Donatists, defended the great right of liberty of conscience. But the feeble voice of such individuals and bodies, was soon lost in the acclaim, "Great are the Patriarchs, Archbishops and other church dignitaries." Freedom was as completely lost in the Church, as it had long been in the State. A few lights only twinkled faintly through the gloom which continued until the Reformation. Some bodies, like the Paulicians, Albigenes and Waldenses, or individuals like Arnold of Brescia, claimed liberty of conscience.

The Reformation, which came at last in the sixteenth century, was founded on a principle, which, if properly carried out, must have burst the shackles of conscience, at once and forever, and restored the Church to its primitive purity. This was the right of each human being to interpret Scripture for himself. This principle was professed by Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, John Knox, and indeed by all the leaders of that great movement; but, if we look beneath the gilding which covers a history of so much substantial interest, we shall find their inconsistency written in the blood of the despised Baptists. We speak not now of the Munster Anabaptists, whose bloody fanaticism probably deserved pun-

ishment, but of the quiet Mennonites and other Baptists in Germany, Switzerland, Holland and Great Britain, who had committed no other offence, but denying infant baptism and State authority in religion.

Those who have not examined the subject, will be alike pained and surprised, at the numerous martyrs of this class. The leaders, who inflicted or authorized these severities, performed great services; but they had not yet emerged from the fog which had so long obscured that subject, into the higher and purer atmosphere of complete religious freedom. None, at least no bodies of men, had risen to that bright region, but those Anabaptist "furies," to whom Bacon had, so ignorantly and scornfully, abandoned the task of persecution. We shall not trouble ourselves about the Paulicians, Albigenses, and Waldenses of the dark ages, concerning whose tenets and practices there has been so much dispute; nor are we anxious, in tracing back our pedigree, to prove that all who have held our distinctive opinions, have been immaculate. In doing so, we should be tempted to vindicate the indefensible conduct and sentiments of all, who may have happened to embrace our doctrines, and bear our name.

It is certain, that the followers of John Knox, nobly as they had resisted Papal tyranny and corruption, were themselves very intolerant, and that the cotemporary English Reformers were not a whit before them in liberality. Yet who considers the Presbyterians and Episcopalians of the present day responsible for their errors and crimes? To varnish them over, while natural, is folly, like that of Romans, who traced their blood to Troy, or of Englishmen, who are not satisfied without finding their ancestors on the bloody field of Hastings. We are afraid, that some zealous antiquarians of our own denomination, may fall into the same blunder, from the danger of which it would be presumption in us to claim entire exemption.

We waive all doubtful affinities; yet "our claims of kindred must be allowed," when we say, that the Mennonites of Holland were Baptists, were numerous, and maintained, in its fullest extent, the doctrine of religious liberty. Un-

like the men of Munster, whose doings are so often thrown in the teeth of Baptists, by assailants who cannot find other weapons, these were quiet Christians, led by a man of undoubted learning, talent and piety. Their repudiation of State aid is mentioned by Mr. Madison in that admirable memorial, which he drew in 1785, just before the establishment of religious freedom. It is said, too, that recent investigations in Holland, have placed their character in a new and more favorable light before the world. Would that their spirit could have been imbibed by the English Independents, who, under John Robinson, sought refuge in that country, and a portion of whom afterwards began the settlement of New-England. In that case, the early pages of Massachusetts' history would have been free from stains, which can be washed out by neither the sophistry, nor the tears of their descendants.

Whence then could the first Virginia colonists have derived the notion of religious liberty, or even toleration, then unknown to the English and Scotch churches, and equally repudiated by Continental Protestants. The obscure sect, which alone advocated it, was every where misunderstood, denounced, and hunted down. The first English publication in favor of it, of which we have a distinct account, was written by a Baptist, imprisoned in Newgate on account of his religion, in 1620, just thirteen years after the landing at Jamestown. This "Humble Supplication to the King's Majesty," which is said to have been very appropriately written with milk, served as the basis of Roger Williams' first publication on the subject, which he sent, in the year 1635, to Mr. Cotton. Williams, although he did not become entirely a Baptist until 1639, had long agreed with the denomination on this point. The famous pilgrims, who came to Plymouth rock, the very year on which the Newgate prisoner wrote his "Supplication," by no means adopted his sentiments, which ought to have been so congenial to the hearts of fugitives from persecution. Their Boston brethren could not endure the younger Sir Henry Vane, who, holding the opinions of Williams, and coming to America at nearly the same time, was appointed Governor



of Massachusetts Bay, shortly after 1630. Several other publications of the same tenor appeared in England before 1644, when the "Bloody Tenent" made its appearance. About the same time, Milton defended the same general principles, with his usual vigor and fire, but stopped short of universal toleration, expressly excepting the Roman Catholics. Williams made no exception to his golden rule of charity, arguing with equal force, love and consistency. But it was not so much this treatise, as his example five years before in establishing a government, of which "soul liberty" was the very essence, that immortalized him. It is not without interest to the reader of history, that he sprang from those Welsh, who, in the fastnesses of their mountains, preserved some relics of apostolical Christianity from the advancing tide of Saxon invasion, and afterwards refused submission to the Papacy. Nor must we forget, that the head which conceived the "Petition of Right," the first barrier attempted against the unconstitutional aggressions of Charles, first discerned the modest talent of Roger Williams, and the hand which drew that memorable instrument, was first stretched out to aid the orphan boy with counsel and education. That boy preceded, by forty-five years, the learned and acute Locke, who wrote, in exile, the first of his celebrated "Essays on Toleration." The great metaphysician has surpassed him in style, (for which he is more indebted to his age, than anything else,) but while maintaining, with unanswerable arguments, the universal principles of *freedom*, not mere *toleration*, has yielded to the influence of his time, by excepting Roman Catholics and Atheists.

In the days of the "Commonwealth," one of its foremost men, Henry Vane, shared the friendship of Williams, as well as his sentiments, and supported with efficient zeal his application to the Long Parliament, for a charter of Rhode Island; with honorable consistency, this illustrious statesman, after the death of Oliver, and the abdication of Richard Cromwell, proposed to make religious freedom an essential feature of the written constitution, unchangeable by Parliament itself, on which he wished to base the English Gov-

ernment. Shame, that a man, who thus anticipated the crowning glory of American institutions, should have been compelled to quit, in disgust, the American soil!!

These remarks on the prevailing sentiment concerning *toleration*, (for the larger idea of entire *freedom* had scarcely been conceived,) will not be found impertinent to the proposed topic of discussion. After what we have said, it is scarcely necessary to add the well-known fact, that "freedom to worship God" was no part of the scheme adopted by the Virginia colonists. Rhode Island and Pennsylvania were the only American settlements, which adopted that principle in its utmost extent, Maryland having done so *partially*, at a still earlier period than either of the others. The exceptions in the last colony were far from extensive, embracing, we believe, only blasphemers and anti-trinitarians, and the actual indulgence was very creditable for that time, especially to Roman Catholics. Lord Baltimore, the Proprietary, had been one of King James' privy counsellors, but having adopted the Catholic faith and (*mirabile dictu*) toleration at the same time, had, in 1624, voluntarily resigned his post, as inconsistent with his sentiments. We have no sympathy with any attempt to detract from the merit of a man, so honest and disinterested, who shamed the Puritans, by receiving and protecting the peaceful, yet persecuted Quakers. This man, a nobleman, not merely of King James, but of Nature, was, in 1628, shamefully expelled from Protestant Virginia, because he could not swear, that he believed such a creature as James or Charles head of the Christian Church.

When the Virginia company was formed, none of its members, or of King James' councilors, had either the inclination or the ability to introduce religious freedom into its plan. Fortune was the object of the colonists, money and power those of the King. No doubt the latter, who fancied himself a great theologian, and exceedingly pious, would have been shocked at the declaration, that the spread of Christianity was not one of his principal motives. Among the settlers, too, of whom in general John Smith has given so unfavorable a picture, there were, doubtless, pious and

moral persons.. He represents the minister Hunt as exemplary and devoted. Smith himself, who might have been a hero of the Iliad, or a Paladin of Charlemagne, was also devout, but, it must be supposed, after the fashion of the Huguenot captain, D'Aubigne, a friend of Henry the Fourth, who was, at once, the greatest duellist and the greatest Protestant of his age. We, by no means, intend to question his sincerity, or that of others, who earnestly strove, each according to his light, to promote religion, both among the settlers and the natives. The royal instructions of 1606 were, "that all persons should kindly treat the savage and heathen people, and use all proper means to draw them to the true knowledge and service of God." The sacrament was administered the 14th day of May, the very day after landing at Jamestown; the School at Henrico, as well as the College of William and Mary, in part, was designed for the instruction of the natives in Christianity. The Rev. Mr. Hunt, it appears, exercised a good influence over the scapegraces around him, and twice, if no more, deserved the blessing of the "peace-maker" by reconciling those in authority. The Rev. Mr. Whitaker, who baptized Pocahontas, from his active benevolence and missionary spirit, was called, "The Apostle of Virginia." Mr. George Thorpe, who, a few years after, managed the lands assigned to the Henrico University, devoted himself, heart and soul, to the conversion and improvement of the natives, to whose cruelty he fell a victim.

We are pleased to recognize the benignant influence of these pious gentlemen, and of the heroic Smith, an influence, however, which made no very deep impression on either the savages or the reckless adventurers, who, as usual, formed the larger part of the colony. Their insubordination was so obvious, and apparently so dangerous, that, in 1611, martial law was established both in Church and State.

In this, however, Virginia did not differ from other incipient colonies, in which the same real or imaginary necessity has been often supposed to justify what Americans call "Lynch" law. Yet it is one of many circumstances, going to prove, that religion was not, as in Massachusetts, Rhode



Island and Pennsylvania, the prominent motive of the emigrants. They fled from debt or poverty, not from oppression, and sought to realize *money*, and not some ideal of religious purity. We have no evidence, that any of the first comers were dissatisfied with the prevalent notions of toleration, or rather intolerance. Virginia, certainly, resembled far more the asylum of Romulus, than the one on Plymouth rock, and must be content with the greatness which has since marked her sons, as well as, of old, those of the Roman commonwealth.

All who came over from England were considered as born in its Church, and the King's instructions required, that "The presidents, councils and ministers should provide that the true word and service of God should be preached, planted and used according to the rites and doctrines of the Church of England." In the bloody military code of 1611, "every man and woman in the colony was required to give an account of his faith and religion to the minister," under pain of severe scourging, while blasphemy, and even a third absence from church on Sabbath, were to be capitally punished. We are told, indeed, that capital punishment was never, and no punishment was often, inflicted; but the enactment itself is conclusive proof, that the governors of the colony had not the first conception of religious liberty, and that dissenters,—to use a term obsolete in its application to the United States, since our Independence,—had no inducement to make Virginia their home. The sneer of Whitaker, "that so few of our English ministers, that were so hot against the surplice and subscription, come hither where neither are spoken of," was surely unprovoked. It was considered King James' colony, and no suitable place for ministers who had the presumption to differ from that modern Solomon. The appeal from the council, on the subject of missions, a paper so much lauded by Dr. Hawks, seems to us a specimen of the pedantic style, which characterized that period indeed, but was most conspicuous in the contemptible monarch.

We believe, with Dr. Hawks, that the ministers had influence, and were ready to exercise it, to prevent oppression

and inhumanity in all cases not immediately affecting their own interests and passions. As an instance, they procured from the rapacious and despotic Governor Argal the pardon of Brewster, whose narrow escape contributed to the repeal of the Draconian code, under which Church and State were alike groaning.

The Episcopal Church was actually established from the first, although there seems to have been no formal enactment to that effect until 1619, and even as late as 1628 the right of the colonial government to administer the oath of allegiance and supremacy was questioned. As before mentioned, attendance on the Episcopal Church was enforced by penalties, just as any civil duty was. Yet, while there are abundant traces of religious carelessness, there are, we believe, none of religious persecution, prior to the landing of Lord Baltimore.

For this there were probably two causes. One of them was the want of material for persecution, occasioned by the homogeneous character of the immigrants, nearly all of whom were nominal Episcopalians, however little interest many of them felt in religion or morality. This identity of religious connexion, by no means proceeded from a similar identity in the mother country. Never were the minds of men in England more active on the subject of religion, as soon after proved by the history of the great rebellion; and mental activity has never yet resulted in unanimity. Those whom earnest examination, or reasons less creditable, had led into dissent, were not likely to seek Virginia. They either preferred staying at home, where their treatment was no worse, or were attracted towards New-England, or some other supposed asylum for oppressed consciences. It is easy to see how this must have led to earlier and more serious collisions in the Northern colonies. Fleeing from persecution in Europe, and naturally expecting from the Puritans the toleration which they had vainly claimed from national churches, they met with a grievous disappointment. They soon found, to their cost, that their own standard of purity, and not real freedom of conscience, was the aim of the famous New-England colonists. The latter believed the es-

sential truths of Christianity so clear to every candid and earnest enquirer, as to justify the use of the civil arm against all who after due admonition and instruction, persevered in what they deemed fundamental errors. This was the theory of Cotton, the opponent of Roger Williams, as it has been of many other excellent Christians, but is equally the theory of Papists and all other persecutors. The theory was also held in Virginia; but some time elapsed before any temptation to carry it out into severe practice was presented. We believe, indeed, that Virginia can boast that no blood ever stained her soil for such a cause.

But for this abstinence we suspect another cause may be assigned, not honorable to her character, we mean religious carelessness. While earnestness betrayed the Puritans into the vices of over-righteousness and spiritual pride, and made them vigilant to detect and punish heresy, the comparative indifference of many Virginia colonists must have made them slack in enforcing their own regulations, where religious purity only, and not the government was endangered. The moment Lord Baltimore, whose newly adopted faith was considered necessarily hostile to every Protestant government, landed in the colony, all were on the alert, and prompt even to stretch their power against a man, whose known excellence, toleration, and preference of conscience to place, ought to have shielded him from every annoyance. We doubt not, that an humble individual, neither meddling with government, nor suspected, from his opinions or position, of an inclination to do so, might have persevered in most dangerous religious errors, undetected by that prying scrutiny, which would certainly have scented them out in New-England.

Thus we see, that religious earnestness, although worthy of all praise, may, from human frailty, betray into great errors, and even crimes. History shows that it has thus betrayed even persons of great excellence. Isabella of Castile, admitted to be one of the best Queens that ever reigned, established the Inquisition, the foulest and most atrocious institution that ever disgraced and tormented humanity. Her very piety made her the dupe and instrument of those, who,



instead of being the ministers of peace, were the ministers of an exterminating war against the asserters of truth and conscience.

It is true, that history also furnishes examples of monarchs, unsuspected of any faith or principle, who have yet butchered in the name of religion. Such was the second Charles, whose treatment of the Scotch Presbyterians is still cited, as the worst instance of Protestant persecution, if that name can be applied to the measures of a prince, who had sought an opiate for his foul conscience in secret reconciliation with Rome, when those measures were mainly executed by his brother, an avowed Catholic. Charles was governed by no religious principle, but solely by hatred of a party which had betrayed his father, and had been in turn deceived by him, when, in his hour of need, he pretended to adopt their covenant, and of whose undying hostility he therefore felt perfectly assured. He found a deadly instrument of his purposes in the sword of Claverhouse, and yet a temporary one, for, like that of Baillie Jarvie, it rusted in its sheath after the battle of Bothwell-brigg; but Isabella originated a *system* which racked the body social of Europe, until it could no longer be endured by human patience.

In using this illustration of the effects produced by zeal and indifference, when both persecute, we by no means intend to carry out the personal parallel. We can never dishonor the "The Old Dominion" by putting it on a moral level with the King, by some reputed to have given it that name. The writer of this article will yield to no one in admiration of the manly openness and whole-souled warmth, of which Charles had no conception, but which have ever marked Virginians.

On the other hand, the Puritans, with earnestness as great as Isabella's, and a far purer faith, could hardly claim her attractive qualities; neither were they guilty of enormities to be compared with those caused by the ingenious system of cruelty unfortunately associated with her name. Yet they have much to answer for to Protestant Christianity, in applying the scourge and the gallows, even once, to those guiltless of any offence but the denial of their infalli-

ble orthodoxy. None know better than those living near Bunker Hill and Lexington, that the slightest encroachment on a sacred and acknowledged right, will justify resistance unto blood, and that tyranny over the soul is as much worse than unconstitutional taxation, as the soul itself is above the yellow dust, by which it is too often enslaved. We readily admit, that the men of that region have performed many and great services to mankind; yet it may be that the wild vagaries in religion, which sometimes flame like meteors in that atmosphere, may be a sort of retribution for having once trampled on the vital principle of Protestantism—the right of private judgment.

We have said that the exclusion of Lord Baltimore, by tendering him the oath of supremacy, was unnecessary and ungenerous. Charles the First considered him a harmless subject, and desired to retain him near his person; while he did not fall short of Milton and Cromwell even, in his ideas of toleration. He would have been equally excluded from Massachusetts, but probably in a different manner. This act of bigotry was soon followed by greater severities, instigated by the Governor, Sir John Harvey, who came into power in 1629, the next year. Dr. Hawks remarks, that up to that time no man had been punished for dissent, and that the supposed witch trial, even if it actually took place within that period, was only proof of a superstition universally prevalent, and not of ecclesiastical tyranny. As far back as 1624, it was enacted: "That there should be uniformity in the church, as near as might be, to the canons of the Church of England; and that all persons should yield a ready obedience to them, upon pain of censure." The decisions of "The Court of High Commission" in England were considered binding in Virginia; but it is said that no penalties had been inflicted under any of these regulations, breathing the very spirit of Charles, then governed by the bigot Laud, while Harvey not only wished to use the laws already in existence, but demanded the enactment of others still more stringent. The despotism of his ten years' administration, produced the common effect of religious oppression which does not utterly crush its victims, by increa-

sing discontent, and creating a violent and general antipathy to the system and agents of oppression. Sir William Berkeley, who, although an accomplished gentleman, belonged to the same arbitrary school, reaped a bitter harvest from the seeds which his predecessor had sowed. One incident will show not only the condition of things at that time, but the spirit that Berkeley was of. As before mentioned, the decisions of "The Court of High Commission" were recognized as binding in the colony, and the authority of Archbishop Laud was no less conclusive in Virginia than in England. "His opinions concerning the Puritans were implicitly received and acted on, so that the colony afforded no countenance, nor even a home to one of that class." Between the time of Harvey and Berkeley, i. e., between 1639 and 1641, laws were enacted against the Puritans, not because there were any, but, it was said, "to prevent the infection from reaching the colony." Such was the state of feeling and law at the accession of Berkeley. Although Strafford had already fallen under the revolutionary axe, and Laud too was nearing the block, and the Parliament commencing war against the King, the loyalty and bigotry of the Governor of Virginia were alike unshaken. The latter feeling found vent in an outrage on a man named "Stephen Reek," who was heard to say jocularly: "that his majesty was at confession with my lord of Canterbury." For this insinuation, that the primate was tending towards Rome, and had too much influence with the monarch, which the body of the English people, and many excellent Episcopalians, fully believed, "he was pilloried for two hours, with a label on his back setting forth his offence, fined fifty pounds, and imprisoned during pleasure." The very year of this atrocity, which must have shocked every independent citizen, "The General Court of Massachusetts" was applied to from Virginia, to send ministers of the gospel into that region, that the inhabitants might be privileged with the preaching and ordinances of Jesus Christ. From this it is plain, that "the case of Reek, which did not stand alone," (we quote from Hawks,) weakened, instead of strengthening, the cause of Episcopacy. Whether the ap-



plication mentioned was prompted by a remnant of the Puritans, who settled in 1619, or by some who came from Massachusetts in 1640, it shows a growing sympathy with that sect, just on the point of becoming predominant in England. However that may have been, the three ministers who came at this request were met by "a law which compelled their speedy return." Loyalty and bigotry were more completely in the ascendant than in the mother country.

After the treaty with Cromwell, or rather with the Commonwealth, the colonists continued to use the Episcopal forms, except prayers for monarchy, and dissenters were not molested until an act was passed against the Quakers, just before the Restoration, probably just about the time when Sir W. Berkeley was restored to power. Yet, even in this interval, it may be inferred from circumstances, that Puritanism was adverse to the general sentiment, and progressed slowly. It is stated by the author of "*Leah and Rachel*," that Cromwell employed "in the holy work of rooting out Popery and prelacy in Maryland," Claiborne, who had been guilty, if not convicted, of rebellion in that colony, in his resistance to the decree assigning Kent Island, previously settled by him, to the Proprietary, Lord Baltimore. The people of Virginia, from which this man had gone, and where he was not liked, had no mind to aid him in the work, which, it is said, he was induced to undertake, "not by religion," but "that sweet, that rich, that large country they aimed at." The Virginians gave refuge to those whom he drove from Maryland, and were, therefore, charged with an "attempt to interrupt the work of righteousness, and retard the establishment of God's religion and the dominion of the saints." Cromwell, who, it seems to us, has been, of late years, as much over-praised as he was once calumniated, sternly reproved the Governor and Council for "the presumption and impiety of their interference, and admonished Virginia to mind her own business."

Yet their conduct was certainly right, although it may not have been dictated by that pure attachment to religious liberty, which ought equally to have protected the unoffend-

ing Lord Baltimore, a quarter of a century before. Hatred for Cromwell and Claiborne, must have originated a new compassion for Catholics, naturally supposed more favorable to the Stuarts than to Cromwell, the common enemy of Papists and that dynasty. This was certainly the feeling of another set of refugees, who met with a still more cordial reception in the colony. These were the English cavaliers, to whom "the house and the purse of Sir W. Berkeley," and doubtless of others also, "were open."

At the Restoration, the religious condition of Virginia was deplorable. Out of fifty parishes, into which it was divided, only ten were supplied with ministers, and many of them had "neither church, parsonage, nor glebe." Little had been effected by an offer, which the Legislature made in 1656, "of twenty pounds to any person who should, at his own proper cost and charge, transport a sufficient minister into the colony."

Hawks tells us "the country was not in the best repute, and that but few clergymen of merit were found willing to make it their permanent habitation." Hammond says: "Many came, such as wore black coats, and could babble in a pulpit, roare in a tavern, exact from their parishioners, and rather, by their dissoluteness, destroy, than feed, their flocks." Sometimes indeed "these wolves in sheep's clothing were, by their assemblies, questioned, silenced, and some forced to depart the country." This was a church worthy the "merry monarch," to whose allegiance Virginia is said to have returned first among the colonies. The Virginians have reason to bless God, that the evil influence of that, and of many following days, did not ultimately prevent them from becoming the earnest and foremost advocates of religious and civil freedom. A century afterwards, the political heavens of "The Old Dominion" were radiant with a galaxy of heroes and patriots. This favorable change was certainly not brought about by the careful re-establishment of the Episcopal, as it certainly could not have been by the re-establishment of any church, but by causes entirely independent of civil magistrates and penalties.

The high-handed Berkeley procured in 1662, the passage

of an act still more severe against the Quakers, which is very justly and strongly censured by Dr. Hawks. He exposes the falsehood of the preamble, which states that "persons often assemble themselves in great numbers, to the great endangering of the public peace and safety," while in fact there was only one, if one, congregation of Quakers, whose persecution this statement was designed to justify.

He suggests, that the true motive of this severity was subserviency to Charles the Second, who declared the principles of this sect inconsistent with any kind of government, and in a letter to the Massachusetts authorities, distinctly informed them, that he did not "wish *any indulgence* whatsoever should be granted to those persons, commonly called Quakers." We can hardly imagine, that even the proud Virginia cavaliers, always loyal, were exempt from the servility that disgraced the era of the Restoration, and the best we can say is, that it never led them to hang Quakers, as the earnest bigotry of Massachusetts did, even before the Restoration.

It is said by Bancroft, that "They riotously interrupted public worship; and women, forgetting the decorum of their sex, and claiming a Divine origin for their absurd caprices, smeared their faces, and even went naked through the streets." "Indecency, however," as he justly remarks, "is best punished by slight chastisements." Quakers are now the most inoffensive of all denominations. The only ground of complaint against them is their refusal to aid, by personal service or money, in the defence of the country. It may be plausibly maintained, that it is a case, in which the civil arm must interfere with the rights of conscience; for, after all, Archbishop Hughes is right in the position, that there must be a limit to religious freedom, although we should differ widely from him, as to the point at which that limit should be placed. Men are fond of indulging in the use of those sounding generalities, absolute freedom and absolute despotism; but there is in all human affairs such a clashing of rights, and duties, and powers, that these absolute quantities can never exist. "*Sic utere tuo ut alienum non lædas,*" must limit the exercise of religious, as well as proper-



ty rights. No man can act out the sincerest religious convictions without regard to the peace and safety of the community. Ravallac may have thought it a religious duty to kill Henry the Fourth; yet it certainly ought not to have exempted him from the gallows. Persons who appear naked, or use improper language in promiscuous assemblies, must expect the jail and the lunatic asylum. Shall Mormons, admitting their sincere belief in the lawfulness and expediency, and even duty, of polygamy, be permitted to break down one of the bulwarks of civilization, morality, and social happiness? Ought Quakers to enjoy the same protection as other citizens, while conscience forbids them to put out a finger or a farthing to aid in that defense? We, of course, are not advocating severity to Quakers, but merely stating a difficulty in applying the great principles of religious freedom to their case. We can dispense with a Quaker's oaths. Can we, likewise, dispense with his military services?

The general proposition, that government must confine itself to temporal interests, is clear as day-light, and worthy of being defended by the life-blood of every man who loves his race. Yet, in candor it must be admitted, that legislators, in honestly promoting those temporal interests, must and will do so, in accordance with the system of religion in which they have been educated, and thus, often jostle against opposing prejudices and habits. A Christian legislator will thus come in conflict with Moslem convictions, and a Moslem legislator with Christian convictions. This difficulty, although real, has not been practically great, in the United States, although it may turn out to be so in the case of the Mormons.

To return from this digression, another act, or part of the same act, may have been directed against the Baptists, if there were any in the colony, unless this, too, was also aimed at the Quakers, who equally refused to bring their children to baptism. It was enacted that "Whoever, in contempt of the Divine sacrament of baptism, should thus refuse, when he might carry his child to a lawful minister within the county, to be baptized, should be amerced two thousand pounds of tobacco, half to the parish and half to the inform-

er." Argument is now useless against a law which all in this country would join in denouncing, although similar laws still disgrace the Protestant States of Denmark, Sweden and Germany.

About the time when the laws just referred to were enacted, a plot was formed among some of Cromwell's old soldiers living in the colony, and being betrayed by one of them, led to the suppression of the meetings at which it had been formed. Danger to the State does not seem, in this case, to have been a mere pretext for suppressing religious assemblies, as it has ever been from the days of Trajan to those of Louis Napoleon.

Fear of Popery appears to have been revived at a somewhat later period, when James the Second was insidiously attempting its restoration in England. But this fear was soon relieved by the accession of William and Mary. Contemporary with their accession was the appointment, as Episcopal Commissary, of James Blair, a Scotchman of talent, learning and usefulness, who contributed more than any one else to the foundation of William and Mary College.

We suppose that Dr. Blair and others in Virginia, must have felt the influence of William of Orange, whose opinions on toleration coincided with those of Locke, whose first "Essay" appeared the very year of Blair's appointment to the office of Commissary. King William is said to have sent over to Virginia, in 1690 and 1699, two bodies of French Huguenots, who had left their country when the Edict of Nantes was revoked. They naturally liked William, the able and untiring foe of their great persecutor, and he, hating all intolerance, hated it most in the invader of his native Holland, and the tyrant of France. Partly the monarch's wishes, and partly their own compassion, unchecked in the case of the Huguenots by opposition or prejudice, made the Virginians very favorable to these French Protestants. They gave them lands on James river, exempted them for some years from taxation, and allowed them freedom of worship, privileges which they extended, in 1713, to a small body of Germans,—Protestants, we pre-

sume,—who settled on the Rappahannock. The policy, as well as kindness, of these measures was strikingly manifested in the case of the French. We know a case, in which three sons of a Huguenot minister came over from Ireland, where their father was living, and took orders in the Episcopal Church, one of them being appointed Professor at William and Mary. This instance is more worthy of note, because their father had indignantly rejected aid from some English Episcopalians, who had annexed, as a condition of their charity, “a certificate of his having received the communion according to the rites of the Church of England,” and had proposed that he, a gentleman and a scholar, and his wife, a lady of refinement, should go to service, and commit the education of their children to these bigots. Yet his sons became Episcopalians, in common with many other Huguenots, as soon as they reached a land where Episcopacy did not approach them in the shape of compulsion. A remark of Beverley’s about the Quakers, shows that the same policy would have succeeded with them. “As for the Quakers,” he says, “’tis observed by letting them alone they diminish daily.”

Near the same time with the first colony of Huguenots, appeared one minister belonging to another set of Calvinists, who do not seem to have been as much favored by the government. Yet differing little, if at all, in doctrine or government, they also belonged to a stock that should have been in favor with William, that Scotch-Irish stock, whose heroic defence of Londonderry had so materially aided him. Yet Foote tells us that their first minister, Mackenie, who settled in Accomac about 1690, “suffered often under the laws of Virginia,” “although by his firmness and ability” he made a favorable impression on the magistrates and Governor. In 1699 the Virginia legislature adopted the toleration act of William and Mary by a general reference, without quoting its words, as if they did not wish its provisions generally and accurately known. Mackenie seems to have been among the first who obtained the benefit of this act, by getting a license to preach in Accomac. As this region was Berkeley’s asylum during Bacon’s rebellion, the



presumption is that the Church party was dominant there ; yet there must have been persons ready to hear, if not to support, the Presbyterian minister. His own "hands ministered to his necessities" by mercantile pursuits. McNish and Hampton, two other preachers, who accompanied him from Ireland, had more difficulty in getting license within the adjacent territory of Maryland, where Episcopal intolerance had been substituted for the Catholic toleration of Lord Baltimore. The English Episcopalians had always evinced a deep interest in the Huguenots from the days of the League, while they had been often brought into unpleasant collision with the Presbyterians inhabiting the British isles. John Knox, indeed, was not always odious in England, where he once resided, and where his model, Calvin, had aided in framing the articles of the Episcopal Church. But there was afterwards a breach between the churches, which had become very wide at the time of the Great Rebellion. The conduct of the Presbyterians, both Scotch and English, had greatly exasperated the English and, with them, the Virginia Episcopalians. The Scotch had not only resisted the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny of Charles, but, as his friends alleged, basely sold him, their trusting guest, to the English Parliament, a fragment of which afterwards had him executed. The English Presbyterians, too, had earnestly resisted despotism, and had overthrown the Church, although too conservative for regicide, republicanism, or even toleration. We must therefore beg leave to differ from Mr. Foote, who, in his "Sketches of Virginia," vol. I., p. 61, asserts, that the "Solemn League and Covenant" "drew the line between the friends of civil and *religious* liberty." He surely cannot forget that this famous instrument was forced on the Scotch nation, by the pains of excommunication, that it bound its signers to persecute Prelatists and Papists, and was designed to establish a National Church. It is true they were goaded on by Charles' abominable interference with their rights of conscience. Yet surely they ought not to have imitated his example, by forcing the Presbyterian doctrine and discipline on England. It was this which made Milton speak of "sav-

ing free conscience from the paw of the Presbyterian wolf," as it created in the Episcopalian mind an entirely different feeling towards the British, from that which they entertained towards the French Calvinists. It is this too, which should prevent American Presbyterians from referring to their European antecedents, when religious liberty is mentioned. We shall see presently whether their preconceived notions did not clog them in the struggle for entire religious liberty, which took place in Virginia, just after the revolution.

Beverly, as quoted by Foote, says of 1705, "The people are generally of the Church of England, which is the religion established by the law in the country, from which there are very few dissenters. They have no more than five conventicles amongst them, namely three small meetings of Quakers, and two of Presbyterians. 'Tis observed that those counties where the Presbyterian meetings are, produce very mean tobacco, and, for that reason, *can't get an orthodox minister to stay amongst them*;" (the italics are ours;) "but whenever they could, the people went very orderly to church."

Does not this show that the reluctance "to preach the Gospel to the poor," common in religious establishments, actually characterized that of Virginia. Dr. Hawks frankly admitting the bad condition of the Episcopal church, traces it, not to the establishment, but to bad regulations, insufficient provisions for ministers, capricious removal of them by the vestries, and a want of a resident bishop to enforce discipline. While these causes had, no doubt, their influence, they did not fully account for the facts. Among the complaints against the mother Church of England, none has been more prominent than neglect of the poor, or has more contributed to give dissenters their present numerical equality, if not superiority. Has not the inability of the Presbyterians even, fully to enlist the sympathies of the humbler classes, given a most telling advantage to the two most numerous denominations in Virginia, the Methodists and Baptists, whose share in forming Virginia character Dr. Foote seems to have ignored?

No church organization will ever free men on earth from love of money ; but it will surely have most influence with the ministers of an establishment, where fixed compensation is the rule by which they measure their expectations and their conduct. Presbyterian ministers, coming from a church, poor, even where Presbyterianism was established, to a region where they were compelled to embrace the voluntary system, occupied those places, where the State preachers could not find tobacco good enough for them. It is probable that the dissenting preachers who came to Virginia were among the most zealous, instead of the most worthless, the class in which Sir William Berkeley places those imported into the colony by the Episcopalians, the establishment being in this respect clearly injurious. It has been generally supposed, too, that discipline in an Episcopal church, even under the immediate control of a bishop, is not at all more strict than in a Congregational or Presbyterian church, especially when the latter is not corrupted, as in Scotland, by union with the State. Capricious removal by the vestry or by the congregation, is an evil necessarily incident to the voluntary system now prevalent in the United States, to a far greater extent, we should suppose, than it could have ever have been experienced by the colonial church ; yet it has not prevented the great prosperity of several denominations.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]



## ART. V.—THE BOOK OF JOB.

*The Book of Job. Part I. The Common English Version, the Hebrew Text, and the Revised Version, with Critical and Philological Notes.* By THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D., Professor of Sacred Literature in Rochester Theological Seminary. N. Y.: American Bible Union. 1856. 4to.

*The Book of Job. Part II. A Translation from the Original Hebrew, on the Basis of the Common and Earlier English Versions. With an Introduction and Explanatory Notes for the English Reader. For the American Bible Union.* By THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D., Professor of Sacred Literature in Rochester Theological Seminary. 1856. 4to.

THE Book of Job must be regarded as in many respects the most remarkable literary production which has come down to our age. Its great antiquity, the obscurity in which every topic connected with its history is involved, the interesting nature of the subject discussed, the sublimity of its ideas, the beauty and purity of its diction, the marks of genius and erudition displayed by the author, the dignified and lofty character of its hero, and the religious and ethical instruction which it imparts, render it peculiarly attractive and valuable to the Christian, the scholar, and the man of cultivated taste and feeling. The book is unique, the only one of the kind with which antiquity has furnished us. There is nothing like it in the range of Grecian, Roman or modern literature. It stands isolated and alone, unrivalled as a work of art among the inspired pages of Hebrew Scripture.

"The discourses in this book," says Herder, "are pearls from the depths of the ocean, loosely arranged, but precious; treasures of knowledge and wisdom in sayings of the olden times." "The Book of Job," says Dr. Conant, "stands at the head of the poetical portions of the Old Testament, in respect to unity of conception and sustained dignity, beauty, and power of execution. The sublime religious lessons which it is

designed to teach, take form in a dramatic poem, whose strains of tragic grandeur and elegiac tenderness, its magnificent pictures of nature, and perpetually varied graces of imagery and expression, claim for it a place among the brightest gems of literature. The inexhaustible richness of poetic material must impress every attentive reader. All along the main track of thought, the virgin soil throws up unnumbered flowers to delight and prolong the way."

If the origin of this poem is rightly ascribed to a period antecedent to the exode of the Israelites from Egypt, then it is not only the earliest composition in the Old Testament, but the most ancient book in existence. Every thing relating to the literature and interpretation of such a book cannot fail to be of interest. Accordingly no part of the Hebrew Scriptures (the Psalter excepted) has more occupied the attention, and exercised the skill and ingenuity of critics and commentators than this. Many are the inquiries in respect to it, upon which a vast amount of literary labor and erudition have been expended. The time of its composition, its author, the country in which the scene is laid, the nature of the poem, and its design,—these are among the numerous points on which a diversity of opinion has existed, and still exists, among the learned.

The first question of interest which is suggested to the mind of the reader on opening the book is, to what department of literature does this poem belong ; to that of history or of fiction? Had Job, whose trials and sufferings are here recorded, a real existence, and are the circumstances related concerning him substantially true? Has the work an historical basis ; or is it purely the product of the imagination? Some have regarded it as a parable, constructed by the pious and ingenious author, to inculcate in the most impressive manner, certain great religious principles and duties. In the earliest Rabbinical notice of the book which has reached us, it is thus spoken of: "Job never was created ; these things are a parable."—(Babylonish Talmud—*Bara Batha*.) This opinion was revived by the celebrated Maimonides in the twelfth century, and has been adopted in later times by Le Clerc, Semler, Michaelis, Stock, and others. About the middle of the last century the notion prevailed to some extent in England, that the Book of Job is an allegory. In 1749 Garnett, in a dissertation on the

book, endeavored to show that it is an allegory in a dramatic form ; that the Babylonish captivity is its principal subject, and that the three friends who came to visit Job in his affliction, represent the children of Edom condoling with the Hebrews in their captivity. Soon after followed the celebrated Bishop Warburton, in his learned and ingenious work on the Divine Legation of Moses. He maintained with Garnett, that the book is an allegory and a drama ; that it was composed after the return of the Jews from Babylonia ; and that its design was to symbolize the national troubles at that period of Jewish history. Job, according to the Bishop, represents the Jewish people ; his wife the idolatrous women, (compare Ezra, ix : 1—2,) with whom the Jews had contracted marriage ; his daughters, the daughters of Ishmael ; his three friends, the three chief enemies of the Jews, who obstructed their efforts to re-build the temple ; namely, Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem ; (compare Neh. ii : 19) while Elihu designates the author of the poem himself. About the same time, Dr. Hodges published a work entitled, “Elihu ; or, an Inquiry into the Principal Scope and Design of the Book of Job.” With Jerome, he held that Job is a type of Christ ; that Elihu was the Son of God himself ; and that the object of the book is to reveal and establish the doctrine of *justification* ! After such ridiculous trifling on the part of Christian expositors, we are not surprised at the confession of Warburton himself, contained in a letter to his friend, Bishop Hurd. “Poor Job ! It was his eternal fate to be persecuted by his friends. His three friends passed sentence of condemnation upon him, and he has been executed in effigy ever since. He was first bound to the stake by a long *catena* of Greek Fathers ; then tortured by Pineda ; then strangled by Caryl ; and afterwards cut in pieces by Wesley, and anatomized by Garnett. I only acted the tender part of his wife, and was for making short work with him. But he was ordained, I think, by a fate like that of Prometheus, to lie still upon his dunghill, and have his brains sucked out by owls.” The question relative to the character of the work, as historical or fictitious, is not, we apprehend, so vital a one as many are dis-



posed to regard it. It is not material to the correct interpretation of the poem generally, nor to its practical utility; nor does it affect its canonical authority, or its divine inspiration. Even our Saviour, we know, frequently employed the vehicle of parable and fiction for the illustration and enforcement of divine truth. No doubt, however, the moral impression is greatly heightened by the conviction, that the circumstances related in the book actually occurred. And this we believe to be the fact. We have not been able to discover any substantial reason for regarding the hero of this book as a fictitious personage. The fact of his existence is expressly asserted in the beginning of the book, and the narrative respecting him, written in simple and unadorned prose, and not in poetry, as Stock, Good, and a few others have imagined, has every appearance of being a veritable record of actual occurrences. Job, moreover, is spoken of in such a manner by the inspired writers of the Scriptures, as to leave no reasonable doubt, that *they* regarded him as a historical personage. The prophet Ezekiel thus speaks of him: "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel and Job, were in it, (the land,) they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God."—(xiv: 14; compare v. 16—20.) No one ever doubted that Noah and Daniel are historical persons. Is it not equally clear that Ezekiel believed in the actual existence of Job also? Take a parallel passage in Jeremiah: (xv: 1) "Then said the Lord unto me, though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be towards this people." Here Moses and Samuel are spoken of as real characters, in the same way as Job is alluded to in Ezekiel. The appeal in Ezekiel would have been of no force in reference to a fictitious person. And the supposition that the prophet would unite real and fictitious persons in this way, is destitute of all probability. Not a solitary instance, unless this be one, can be found in the sacred volume, of such a juxtaposition. We have here, then, the testimony of the prophet Ezekiel, or rather of Jehovah himself speaking by the prophet, that Job was a real person. The following passage occurs in the Epistle of James: (v: 11) "Ye have heard of the pa-

tience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord ; that the Lord is very pitiful, and of tender mercy." Is there any reason to doubt that James, in this passage, intended to refer to the *actual* sufferings and patience of a *real* person, and to the happy termination which the Lord put to those sufferings? The Apostle speaks of Job here just as he does of Elijah in verse seventeen. It has been said, indeed, that if James had not only written, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job," but also, "Ye have heard of the benevolence of the good Samaritan," no reader would have felt surprised, or considered himself authorized to infer that James regarded the good Samaritan as a historical person. But has James done this? Or has any other sacred writer done the like? Most certainly not. It will be time enough to admit the truth of the allegation, after the fictitious character of Job,—the thing here taken for granted,—has been proved, or when the appeal can be made to an analogous case.

If we examine the book itself, we shall find that it bears all the marks of being a true history. Not only is the name of the suffering hero given, and the place of his abode, but his possessions and family are minutely described, and all the prominent traits of his character,—his piety, his integrity, his faith, his patience, his dignity, his fortitude,—are distinctly exemplified. The numerous localities specified in the book are all real, and the names are none of them significant, except, perhaps, Job, which is supposed to mean *the persecuted*. The book, taken as a whole, has none of the characteristic marks of a parable. Parables are always concise. We do not find, or expect to find, in this species of composition, a minute specification of particulars respecting the parties concerned, which have no bearing on the point specially aimed at, such as their genealogy, the circumstances of their families, their children, friends, age, wealth, etc., which we meet with here. Details of this description are omitted, and such only as are immediately connected with its scope and design, or are indispensable to the verisimilitude of the parable, are introduced. The reason for such omission is obvious. To dwell

on circumstances and events unconnected with the main design of the parable, would greatly impair if not destroy its effect. Accordingly we find all parables brief and unencumbered with details; in both which respects they are totally unlike the Book of Job. This book, then, cannot be a parable. Is it an allegory? No doubt an allegory may be far more extended than a parable; and in a lengthened allegory, like the *Pilgrim's Progress*, a detailed statement of names, places, etc., would not be inappropriate, because they might be introduced with special reference to the design of the work, and might all have an important bearing upon it. But where within the compass of the sacred volume, shall we find an extended allegory or fictitious narrative, unless this be one? To suppose the Book of Job an allegory is, then, opposed to the usage of the sacred writers; and the truth of the hypothesis cannot be admitted without proof. Besides, Job cannot possibly represent the Jewish people, according to the fancy of Garnett and Warburton; for the whole mystery of his sufferings lies in their arising from no fault on his part; whereas those which befel the Jews are always represented to be the just desert and consequence of their national sins. Nor is there the slightest allusion in the whole book to the circumstances of the Jewish people during their exile or after their return. The reasons which have been assigned for regarding this book as entirely fictitious, are of very little weight. They are chiefly the interview between Jehovah and Satan in the prologue; the introduction of Jehovah as one of the speakers near the close of the poem; the highly figurative and poetic character of the composition, and the round and double numbers in the first and last chapters.

The interview between Jehovah and Satan with other angelic intelligences in the Court of Heaven is supposed to militate against the historical verity of the entire book. But it may be safely admitted that this interview is parabolical, and is designed to teach us the administration of Divine Providence in the government of the world, the existence and agency of good and evil angels, especially of Satan, the great adversary and accuser of the human race, and the



subjection of both to the control of the Almighty. Nor would this admission cast the least doubt on the substantial truth of the facts respecting Job himself, narrated in the book. A particular scene or passage in a work may be parabolic in its nature without affecting the historical character of the remainder. The Bible abounds with representations of this sort. The prophetic visions of Isaiah, (vi: 1) of Ezekiel, (chap. i) of Paul, (2 Cor. ii: 24) and of John, (Rev. iv: 1—2) represent the proceedings of Providence with reference to our intellectual powers and modes of conception; and the vision of Micaiah, (1 Kings xxii: 19—23,) and that of Zechariah (ii: 13, iii: 1) furnish cases precisely parallel to this in every respect. Such visions or parabolic representations, introduced either from necessity or from some other cause, convey instruction just as truly and properly, as if they were exact copies of outward objects. The representation of Jehovah speaking out of the whirlwind, may be merely a strong and sublime effort of the author's imagination, by which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, he terminates the controversy in the most masterly and dignified manner.

As to the poetic character of the work, this cannot be deemed a valid objection against the real existence of Job. It might be true that he lived and suffered in the manner recorded of him, and that such a discussion as is here related actually took place, though the speeches delivered on the occasion may have subsequently been put into their present poetic form by Job himself, or by some other person. Neither the historical nor the inspired verity of the book compels us to suppose, that the speeches of Job and his friends were originally uttered in the exact terms in which they are here recorded. But the *substance* of what was said, the *ideas* expressed by the different interlocutors during the protracted conference, are faithfully communicated under the garb of the sublimest poetry.\* How much,

---

\*“It is not necessary for the historical truth of the Book of Job, that its language should be a direct transcript of that actually employed by the different characters introduced into it; for in such case we should scarcely have a single book of real history in the world. The Iliad, the

if any, of what was said may have been spoken precisely as here recorded, it would be impossible for us to determine, and of no use for us to know. It is enough that, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, the discussion between Job and his friends has been recorded in the present shape, as best adapted to accomplish the moral purposes for which the book was written.

It has been further alleged, that the round and double numbers which occur in the book, give to the whole narrative an artificial character unfavorable to its historical verity. But this is a circumstance which not uncommonly occurs in historical statements, without impairing the truthfulness of those statements. When it is said that the possessions of Job were exactly doubled, it is not necessary to suppose that this was in every respect *literally true*. The same remark applies to the round numbers. Suppose it were affirmed, that in a certain battle three thousand men were killed, should we infer, because a round number was given, that no persons whatever had been killed, or that no battle had been fought? Certainly not. Would it have been more satisfactory, or confirmatory of the truth of the main facts, if it had been stated with specific and minute accuracy that two thousand, nine hundred and ninety-eight were killed? Why should we apply more strict and rigid rules to the interpretation of the Bible, in order to disprove the historical character of any portion of it, than we do to other books? It has been maintained, we are aware, by some, that every thing took place precisely as here related, and that the discourses of Job, of his friends, and of Jehovah, were delivered exactly in the form and words in which they are here expressed. But few in the present day, we apprehend, will be found to advocate this extreme and,

---

Shah Nameh, and the Lusiad, must at once drop all pretensions to such a description; and even the pages of Sallust and Cæsar, of Rollin and Hume, must stand upon very questionable authority. It is enough that the real sentiment be given, and the general style copied; and this, in truth, is all that is aimed at, not only in our best reports of parliamentary speeches, but, in many instances, (which indeed is much more to the purpose,) by the writers of the New Testament, in their quotations from the Old.—J. M. GOOD'S TRANSLATION OF JOB; INTRODUCTION, PAGE 17.

as it seems to us, improbable view. "I hold," says Luther, "that the Book of Job is a history, in a poetic form, of what happened to a person, but not in such words as those in which it is written."

With regard to the country of Job, or the scene in which the poem is laid, there has been a diversity of opinion among Biblical scholars. Some suppose it to have been the valley of Guta, near Damascus. But on this supposition the introduction of the book is at variance with the book itself; for here we meet with no Syrian, but only with Arabian and Egyptian scenes. Others regard Idumea, in Arabia Petræa, as the residence of Job. But there are two passages in the writings of the prophet Jeremiah which conflict with this opinion. In Lam. iv: 21, we read: "Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz." At first view this passage would seem to indicate that Uz was a part of Edom. But a more careful examination of it shows that it was a distinct country, at that time in possession of the Idumeans. This is confirmed by Jer. xxv: 20, in which the lands of Uz and of Edom are mentioned as separate and distinct. The most probable opinion is, that Uz was situated in the northern part of Arabia Deserta, between Palestine and Idumea on the west, and the Euphrates, or Babylonia on the east. Ptolemy makes mention of a tribe in this region called *Aisirai* or *Aisirai*. In the Septuagint Uz is rendered *Ausitis*, and in the Apocryphal Supplement to the Septuagint, it is said of Job, that "he dwelt in the land of Ausitis, on the confines of Idumea and Arabia." This country is more entitled to the appellation of the East than Idumea, and would be nearer the Chaldeans and Sabæans, by whose incursions the property of Job is said to have been taken or destroyed.

The period in which Job lived is a different and distinct question from that of the composition of the book which bears his name, though the two have been often confounded. They may or may not synchronize. Even those critics who place the date of the book at a very late period of the Jewish state, acquiesce in the prevalent opinion as to the great antiquity of the age of Job. The current of internal evi-



dence sets strongly in favor of the hypothesis, that the venerable sufferer lived at a very remote period. His great longevity clearly places him in the patriarchal times. He survived his afflictions one hundred and forty years, and was probably more than fifty years old when they occurred. The religion of Job is precisely of the same type with that which prevailed in the time of Abraham, and anterior to the institution of the Mosaic ritual. In its character it is strictly patriarchal,—a religion of sacrifices, but without any official priesthood. Job performed the functions of the priestly office in his own family, according to primitive usage. The only species of false worship mentioned in the poem is Sabianism, or the worship of the heavenly bodies,—the most ancient form of idolatry recorded in the annals of the human race.—(See chap. xxxi: 26—28.) The Satan also permitted by Divine wisdom to be the instrument of Job's affliction, belongs, as appears from the whole narrative, to the simple theology of patriarchal times, and not to the later period of the Hebrew commonwealth, as the advocates for the modern origin of the book have alleged. The simplicity of life, of manners and customs, moreover, which we find exhibited in the book, corresponds to that of the patriarchal age. And finally, the absence of all allusion to the *exodus* of the Israelites from Egypt, and to the series of wonders which preceded and followed that event; to the revelations made to the Hebrew nation in the desert, and their journey to Canaan; or to the Mosaic law, rites and ceremonies, leads to the belief, that the events described in this book could not have taken place subsequently to the time of Moses; while the mention of names which occur among the descendants of Nahor, Keturah, Ishmael and Esau, renders it probable, that Job lived not more than three or four generations later than Abraham.

Who was the author of this book? Where and in what age did he live? These are questions which have greatly perplexed the learned, and which, with the limited information we possess, will never, perhaps, be answered in a manner entirely satisfactory. With regard to the time of its composition, critics have assigned periods differing not

less than a thousand years ; some placing it anterior to Moses, and others subsequent to the Babylonish exile. And, as to its authorship, it has been ascribed, among others whose names are unknown, to Job himself, to Elihu, to Moses, to Solomon, and to Ezra.

"The name of our minstrel sage," says Umbreit, "has perished in the oblivion of antiquity ; but his brilliant genius, like a star of the first magnitude, points from the shades to the Almighty brightness, which spreads over all worlds the ethereal light of Divine love." "Who," says Herder, "will point us to the grave of him whose soul kindled with these Divine conceptions, to whom was vouchsafed such access to the counsels of God, to angels, and the souls of men, who embraced in a single glance the heavens and the earth, and who could send forth his living spirit, his poetic fire, and his human affections to all that exists, from the land of the shadow of death, to the starry firmament, and beyond the stars? No cypress, flourishing in unfading green, marks the place of his rest. With his unuttered name he has consigned to oblivion all that was earthly, and leaving his book for a memorial below, is engaged in a yet nobler song, in that world where the morning stars sing together."

From a misapprehension of the meaning of chap. xxxii : 16—17, Lightfoot supposed that Elihu composed or arranged the dialogue in its present form. But the passage, accurately rendered, does not imply any claim to authorship. The opinion was early entertained, that Ezra composed the book subsequent to the return of the Jews from the Babylonish exile. This opinion, after being permitted to sleep for many years, was revived by Le Clerc, and warmly supported by Warburton. But no one who has compared the acknowledged writings of Ezra with Job, can for a moment soberly entertain such an idea. Several recent critics have assigned the composition of the poem to the period of the exile, without being able to arrive at any definite result as to its author. But a decisive argument against this position is derived from the *language* in which it is written, which is remarkably pure, and free from those Chaldaisms which constantly occur in the books written about that time. The alleged Chaldaisms which have been pointed out, may be explained equally well as Arabisms, and these indicate a very early, instead of a modern origin. Eichhorn remarks in reference to this point: "Let him who is qualified for such researches, only read first a writing tainted with Aramæisms, and next the Book of Job, and he will find them di-

verging as east from west. There is no example of an independent original work composed in pure language after the exile." Equally conclusive is the finished poetical character of the book. The force of this argument is acknowledged even by Ewald, who says: "The high skill displayed in this book cannot be well expected from later centuries, when poetry had by degrees generally declined, and particularly in the higher art required by large compositions; and language so concise and expressive as that of our author, is not found in writings of later times." The assertion of several recent expositors, that the doctrine of Satan, who is introduced in the prologue of the book, was of Chaldaean origin, and obtained credit among the Jews during the Babylonish exile, and that consequently we must assign a very late period to the composition of Job, has been shown by Hengstenberg and other interpreters to be undoubtedly erroneous.

We have historical evidence of the existence of this book at an earlier period than the exile. That it must have been written and well known before the time of Jeremiah, and consequently before the time of King Josiah and the Babylonish captivity, is evident from the following considerations. The book was undoubtedly known to Jeremiah. Compare Jer. xx: 14—18, with Job, iii: 3—10; and Jer. xvii: 1, with Job, xix: 24. There are also passages in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, in which allusion is clearly made to this book. Compare Lam. iii: 7—9, with Job, xix: 8; and Lam. ii: 15—16, with Job, xii: 4. That Job was the earlier composition is evident from a comparison of the writings of each respectively. Jeremiah shows himself throughout dependent on previous authors; while Job, on the contrary, exhibits decided marks of originality and independence. It is clear, therefore, that the writer of Job did not imitate Jeremiah, but the reverse.

Cotemporary with Jeremiah was Ezekiel. The passage (xiv: 14—20) in the writings of this prophet, already alluded to, proves, we think, conclusively that Job was well known to him as an eminently pious man, that he and his cotemporaries were acquainted with the remarkable circumstances of his history, and that his information was obtained



not from uncertain tradition, but from an authentic source. It would seem to be morally certain not only that Job lived prior to the age of both these prophets, but that his life had then been depicted in the book which we possess. In the book of Amos, still earlier, there are two passages which correspond in a striking manner with the Book of Job. Compare Amos, iv: 13, (also Isa. xl: 22,) with Job, ix: 8; and Amos, v: 8, with Job, ix: 9. The coincidences in these cases are such as could hardly have been fortuitous, but indicate either that Amos was acquainted with the Book of Job, or that the author of the Book of Job was acquainted with the Book of Amos. That Job, and not Amos, is the original, is evident from the fact that the expressions in Job are much stronger and bolder than in Amos, and have also the whole connexion on their side. Now Amos prophesied nearly two hundred years earlier than Jeremiah, (B. C., 798—784,) and the Book of Job must have been composed considerably earlier than that of Amos. The coincidence between the Book of Job and that of Proverbs, both in the general views of the Divine administration indicated in the two works, and in numerous forms of expression, shows that the former must have been written before the time of Solomon, and that the royal poet was quite familiar with it. Some critics have inferred from this resemblance that Solomon was the author of Job. But besides the fact that no mention is made of Job among the works of Solomon, (1 Kings, v: 12—13; iv: 32—33,) the poetical style and the manner of thinking are totally different in Job from what they are in the acknowledged productions of Solomon. The poetry of the latter is characterized by brilliancy; that of the former by sublimity. Several of the Davidic Psalms (xxxvii and xxxix) are so nearly related to the Book of Job in respect to the leading thought and the form of expression, that we can hardly doubt the royal Psalmist was acquainted with the latter. It would seem, then, from what has been said, that the Book of Job had been committed to writing, and was considered as authoritative before the times of David and Solomon. And on examining the book itself, we discover nothing which could not have been written be-

fore the *exodus* from Egypt, but very much which goes to show that it must have been written prior to that event. There are various allusions to historical circumstances which occurred anterior, but to none which transpired in connexion with or subsequent to the *exodus*. "Now it is improbable," says Jahn, "that a writer posterior to this event should have possessed so much ingenuity and art, as to transfer himself entirely to such a remote antiquity, and, altogether unmindful of the events of his own age, to write as if he had lived antecedently to the exode. Nor is it easy to conceive that a Hebrew of Palestine should acquire such a profound knowledge of Egypt and Arabia, as the author of this book exhibits." The writer appears to have at least heard of the river Jordan, (xl: 23,) but there is no such reference to Palestine, as would lead us to suppose that he was an inhabitant, or had ever been a visitor, of that country. We must look beyond the Holy Land, then, for the author of this book, and to a period antecedent to the exode. In the earliest Jewish mention of the book which has come down to our times, (the Babylonish Talmud,) it is ascribed to Moses as its author. This opinion prevailed with the Jewish Rabbins, and with many of the Greek and Syrian Fathers. And it has been adopted in modern times by Michaelis, Kennicott, Jahn, Dathe, Good, Dr. Conant, and other distinguished scholars. If the great Jewish lawgiver was the author of the work, it must have been written by him before the departure of Israel from the land of Egypt. There is very much to favor this opinion. Midian, where Moses resided for a considerable time, was conterminous with the land of Uz. He was favorably situated, therefore, to become acquainted with the facts relative to the patriarch, whose death could not have occurred long before. He was eminently qualified for the composition of such a work. His education, his poetic genius, his thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language, his intimate acquaintance with the scenery and natural history both of Arabia and Egypt, admirably fitted him for the undertaking. The book appears well adapted to console the Israelites under the yoke of Egyptian bondage, and to impress on their minds the great duties of submission to the will of God in

adversity, and implicit confidence in his over-ruling Providence. The hypothesis that it was written by Moses, antecedently to the promulgation of the law, furnishes us also with a satisfactory explanation of the fact, that a work having nothing whatever to do with the Jewish religion, polity, or manners, should have been admitted into the sacred canon, and regarded with such veneration by that remarkable people. An objection, however, has been urged against this view, founded on the style which characterizes the poetic portion of the work. Bishop Lowth, whose judgment in regard to a question of this kind is entitled to high respect, does not hesitate to pronounce the style of Job to be materially different from that of Moses, even in his poetic compositions. Michaelis also admits the force of this remark. Herder says :

“I rank Moses very high as a poet, but find no more evidence that he wrote the Book of Job than that Solon wrote the *Iliad*, or the *Eumenides* of *Æschylus*. I can boast, I believe, of having studied the poetry of Moses, and this, also, without prejudice. I make allowance, too, for the difference which a change of circumstances, age, occupation, etc., would produce. Still they appear to me as directly opposed to each other as the east and the west. The poetical style of Job is throughout concise, full of meaning, forcible, heroic, always, I may say, in the loftiest tone of expression and the boldest imagery. Moses, even in the sublimest passages, has a more flowing and gentle style. The very peculiarities in the style of Moses, and in the arrangement of his imagery, are foreign to this book. The voice to which we are here listening, comes forth in rough and interrupted tones from among the rocks, and can never have been trained in the low and level plains of Egypt.”

In view of this objection, Lowth, Magee, Lee, Barnes and many others, have adopted the opinion that the body of the work was written by Job himself, and fell into the hands of Moses while in Midian, who, perhaps, wrote the introduction and conclusion, and published it among the Hebrews as a part of Divine revelation. We are furnished with the most direct and positive testimony in the poem itself, that the writing as well as publishing of books was known in the time of Job.—(xix: 23—24; xxxi: 35.) Job, moreover, lived after his calamities one hundred and forty years, during which ample leisure would be found by him to make a record of his trials. The sufferings he endured, also, were so peculiar, and the lessons they were designed to teach



were so important, as to render it highly proper that he should, for the benefit of mankind, make a record of them. And no one could be found so well acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, and so familiar with all the arguments employed in the discussion with his friends, as himself. And, finally, the record of his own imperfections and failings is just such as we might expect from Job, on the supposition that he was the author of the book. Moses may have written the introductory and concluding parts, from information derived from authentic tradition; and in transcribing the poetic parts, he may have made some small and unimportant alterations, which will account for occasional and partial resemblances of expression between it and the Pentateuch, if any such exist. Moses, then, if not the author, was the editor of Job, and in either case it would readily find a place among the canonical books of Hebrew Scripture. Spanheim conjectured that the book was originally composed in Arabic by Job, and translated by Moses, during his sojourn with Jethro, his father-in-law, in Midian. But it has no appearance of being a translation from a foreign original. The purity and freedom of the language and style are inconsistent with such a supposition.\* And the fact that no writing, perhaps, of the Old Testament may be more frequently illustrated from the Arabic, is accounted for on the ground that it was written before the separation of the Shemitic dialects had been carried to any considerable extent.

It has been a question of some interest among critics to what class or department of poetry this book belongs. Some have maintained that it is a regular epic, and that as such it possesses unity of action, delineation of character, plot and catastrophe, not exactly indeed in the Grecian, but in the Oriental style. By others, with more plausibility, it has been regarded as a regular drama or tragedy. It is

---

\*“The language,” says Eichhorn, “is too strong and nervous; the sentences are too pointed; the style is too full, and round, and harmoniously constructed. The remarkable parallelism, which is in no book so accurately kept up from beginning to end, would be unattainable in a translation.”—EINLEIT, § 641.

written in the form of a dialogue, and there is a tragic interest surrounding the character of Job. Thus far it does partake of a dramatic character. But it is not a drama, according to our conceptions of the drama. Except in the introduction and conclusion, which form no part of the poem, the book contains no action whatever, not even of the simplest kind; and action is essential to the drama. Nor are there any scenes, or other changes, which belong to this species of poetry. All is motionless, and without variation. Indeed the drama, according to our conceptions, was entirely unknown in the days of Job. It was a modern invention of the Greeks, about four centuries before the birth of Christ, and it is so little in accordance with the taste and customs of the Orientals, that the Arabians, after they had become acquainted with the Grecian dramatic literature, would not, we are told, introduce it among themselves. The book is a philosophical religious discussion, in a poetic form—a concession or colloquy of wise men in relation to a great moral question. “The whole book,” says Eichhorn, “may be regarded as a dialogue of sages respecting the government of the world, with a prologue and epilogue.” The Orientals are said to be extremely fond of elaborate and learned discussions, carried on in a lofty figurative style, and listen to them with great patience and attention.

The subject of the book, according to Dr. Conant, is—*The Mystery of God's Providential Government of Men.* “This subject,” the Doctor continues, “is treated in two ways: I. By an exhibition of the difficulties which it presents to the finite mind; of the conflicts and the erroneous conclusions of the human spirit, in striving to reconcile them with the eternal principles of justice and goodness. II. By showing man's true position in reference to the ways of the Eternal and Infinite.” The question is discussed with perpetual reference to the sufferings of the patriarch Job, whose piety and integrity Jehovah has resolved to test, by permitting him to be visited with the heaviest calamities. This purpose of the Divine mind, however, is not disclosed to any of the parties immediately interested; and they are left in total darkness as to the cause and design of

these calamities. With these the reader is made acquainted, by means of a parabolic representation contained in the introduction to the poem. He is thus put at the outset in possession of the key which unlocks the mysteries of the book. Placed on an eminence from which he is permitted to look down on the scene below him, he beholds the pious but afflicted patriarch, and his honest but mistaken friends, wandering about in darkness and error. As the discussion proceeds, his sympathies become more and more enlisted in behalf of the stricken sufferer, knowing, as he does, that his sore afflictions are heaped upon him, not, as his friends erroneously supposed, because he was the worst, but, on the contrary, the best of men; and that his chastisements are not the penal consequences of his crimes, but for the purpose of developing his character, demonstrating his sincerity and integrity, vindicating the Divine government, and furnishing to the world a most instructive example of patient endurance under the heaviest trials.

"The first division (of the book)," says Dr. Conant in his admirable analysis, "presents a good man, one pronounced perfect and upright by God himself, suffering under an accumulation of sudden and terrible misfortunes. From the height of worldly happiness, rich, honored, surrounded by a numerous and prosperous family, he suddenly finds himself poor, childless, the prey of a loathsome and incurable disease, an object of contempt and insult to the meanest outcasts of society. In this extremity, three of his former friends pay him a visit of condolence. These men, venerable in years and character, princes and sages of their tribes, represent the traditionary wisdom of the time, the views and maxims based on the limited experience of the early patriarchs respecting the government of God. According to these, the Omniscient, who cannot be deceived, the Almighty, who cannot be resisted, and the Infinitely Just, who can do no wrong, must, by the laws of his own nature, deal with every man according to his deserts; and his treatment is therefore the true index of the man's moral character. Accordingly, their addresses to Job assume his guilt as the cause of his sufferings. And since the degree of guilt is the exact measure of punishment, these extraordinary judgments mark him out as an eminent transgressor. Though his crimes have escaped detection by man, they cannot elude the searching eye of God, who has thus stripped off his disguises, and exposed him to deserved shame. Hence their reproofs and exhortations all have it for their object, to induce him to acknowledge and repent of his wickedness, and to justify his righteous Judge. Job, on the other hand, conscious of his rectitude, denies their inferences in regard to himself, and condemns the stand-point from which they judge of men as false and untenable. Their traditionary wisdom he confronts with the actual observation of life, showing, by examples familiar to all, that the wicked are not thus dealt with according to their deserts. \* \* \* For himself he can appeal, for the purity, uprightness, and beneficence of his life, to those who have been witnesses of his most private ac-



tions; \* \* \* and he dares appeal to the All-Seeing himself for the integrity of his heart, the sincerity and constancy of his piety towards God. Yet he is visited with unexampled judgments, and made the scorn and by-word of men. In two respects Job and his opponents hold the same ground. He recognizes equally with them, that the Divine government rests on the immutable foundations of truth and right. Nay, he exercises a higher trust in it than they. While they demand retribution on earth as the condition of their trust, he trusts without hope of being righted on earth: but through his present misery and humiliation, anticipates with triumphant confidence his vindication in a future state of existence. Though despairing of help from God on this side the grave, God is still his only refuge and hope.

“Even now my witness is in heaven,  
And my attestor is on high.”  
“I know my Redeemer lives.”

But this certainty of future right, though it sustains the sufferer, does not solve the mystery of the present wrong. \* \* \* In another point Job and his opponents agree, viz.: that no man can be absolutely pure in the sight of God. It is not on the ground of absolute purity that he claims different treatment. His complaint is, that moral character is not the standard by which the good and evil of this life are distributed.”

At this stage of the discussion another enters the lists, who, without entirely coinciding with either party, holds a middle course. He agrees with Job that God sometimes permits the righteous to fall into misfortunes; at the same time contending that the chastisements of the Lord are disciplinary and corrective, and intended for the benefit of mankind. They are the visitations of a Father, seeking to win back his erring children, and to confer on them the highest good. The Almighty is then introduced, who by contrasting the ignorance and imbecility of Job with his own greatness and majesty, as exhibited in the works of creation, shows that he is the sovereign Ruler of the world; and that it is his rightful prerogative to do what he will with his own; that man, “whose life is a span, whose place in the universe is but a point, who cannot understand the laws of the material world, nor fathom the mysteries of the least of God’s works,” may not presume to comprehend and judge the eternal counsels of his moral government; and that consequently he should acquiesce with humble resignation in the Divine dispensations, in the firm conviction that, however inscrutable, they must be infinitely wise, and just, and good, since they proceed from him whose works display infinite wisdom, power and benevolence.

Attempts have been made by some of the German critics to destroy the *integrity* of the Book of Job, and they have applied the pruning knife of destructive criticism to several portions of it, as for example, the prose introduction and conclusion, the whole discourse of Elihu, and a considerable part of the last long discourse of Job, which is thought to contain sentiments discordant with those elsewhere expressed by him. But the reasons assigned for discarding these passages are such as have entirely failed to satisfy the better and more sober class of critics. "There are not only no plausible critical grounds for eliminating either of these passages," says Palfrey, "but their rejection would mar the integrity of the composition, disturb its *lucid order*, confuse that skillful development of character, for which, among its other beauties, it is distinguished, and efface the traces of that *naturalness*, which, in such a poem, is the highest attainment of art."

The Book of Job is one of the most difficult books of the Old Testament to translate, and is believed to be less accurately rendered in our common version than any other in the sacred volume. Much of it, indeed, is quite unintelligible, and evinces a consciousness on the part of the translators, of their inability to discern the sense of their author. The attention of Hebrew scholars during the last half century has been particularly directed to this book, and numerous attempts have been made, by means of translations and commentaries, to elucidate its meaning. In the English language there have been published amended versions from the pens of J. M. Good, Stock, Lee, Boothroyd, Fry, Wemyss, Umbreit, (from the German,) Noyes and Barnes. And now to these is to be added the translation of Dr. Conant, the title of which is placed at the head of this article. It is published under the auspices of the American Bible Union, and is the first instalment of the Revised Version of the Old Testament proposed to be published by that Society. On the title-page it is correctly represented to be a Translation on the Basis of the Common and Earlier English Versions. The verbal alterations, which do not affect the sense, and which were not required either by the changes which

have taken place in the use of language, or by a faithful adherence to the original text, are, we think, too numerous to justify us in calling it a *Revised Version*, as the expression is commonly understood, and as it is defined in the rules and instructions prescribed by the Society to its revisers. The book is published in three separate parts. The first part contains the Common Version, the Hebrew Text, and the New Translation, in parallel columns, very conveniently arranged for comparison. It contains, also, a body of critical and philological notes and authorities, designed to sustain the changes made in the text. These notes are exceedingly valuable as far as they go; but they would have been more satisfactory to scholars generally had they been more full, the authorities more numerous, and less restricted to one particular class, and had the quotations from German writers been translated into English. The second part contains the New Version, beautifully printed in parallel lines, (the numbers marking the verses being placed in the margin,) and divided into paragraphs, according to the sense. The advantages of this arrangement for assisting the reader to understand the book, are too obvious to need remark. The version is preceded by an Introduction, and accompanied with explanatory notes for the English reader. In the Introduction, the principal topics connected with the literature of the book are discussed in a concise but perspicuous manner. The argument of the poem, in particular, is exhibited with greater clearness and force, than in any work which has come under our observation. The doctrine inculcated is admirably summed up in the following terms:

We are taught: I. That the apparently arbitrary distribution of the good and evil of this life, is not the result of chance or caprice; God, the Creator and Judge of all, the infinitely wise, just and good, presides over and controls the affairs of earth. His providential care extends to all his creatures. He has the power to restrain or chastise wrong, and avenge suffering innocence; and this power he uses, when and how he will. II. That the government of the world belongs of right to him who created it; whose infinite justice can do no wrong; whose perfect wisdom and love devise only what is best; whose omniscience cannot err in the choice of means; who is infinite in power, and does all his pleasure. III. That to know this is enough for man; and that more than this he cannot know—God can impart to him no more, since omniscience alone can comprehend the purposes and plans of the Infinite. IV. That man's true position is implicit trust in the Infinitely Wise, Just and Good, and submission to



his will. That here alone the finite comes into harmony with the Infinite, and finds true peace, for if it refuses to trust until it can comprehend, it must be in eternal discord with God and with itself."

The Notes accompanying this part of the work are brief, but embody a large amount of valuable information and instructive remark for the explanation of the text. The translation, taken as a whole, appears to us, both in respect to accuracy and elegance, to surpass any work of the kind which has yet appeared on the Book of Job in our language, and to be a most valuable contribution to our stores of Biblical literature. It evinces on the part of the learned author, a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language, a familiar acquaintance with the latest and best continental works on this book, a discriminating and accurate judgment, and a cultivated and delicate taste capable of detecting, appreciating and exhibiting to the mental eye of the English reader the poetic beauties of the original. We proceed to give a few extracts from the version, as examples of the changes from the Common Version, which Dr. Conant has made, accompanied with a few remarks of our own.

III: 9.—C. V. Neither let it see the dawning of the day.

R. V. Neither let it behold the eye-lids of the morning.

Dr. C. has here happily transferred the beautiful figure of the original, which is lost in our Common Version.

III: 12.—C. V. Why did the knees prevent me?  
Or, why the breasts that I should suck?

R. V. Why were the knees ready for me?  
And why the breasts that I might suck?

The word "prevent," in the sense here intended, is now obsolete, and is properly exchanged for its equivalent expression, "ready for." The substitution of "might" for "should" is obviously correct, and conducive to perspicuity.

IV: 6.—C. V. Is this thy fear, thy confidence,  
Thy hope, and the uprightness of thy ways?

R. V. Is not thy fear thy confidence?  
Thy hope, it is the uprightness of thy ways.

By "fear" is here intended the fear of God, or true pi-

ety. This is represented to be the ground of Job's confidence. The Common Version is here quite unintelligible.

V: 15.—C. V. But he saveth the poor from the sword, from their mouth,  
And from the hand of the mighty.

R. V. So he rescues the victim from their mouth,  
And the needy from the hand of the strong.

Here, by a slight change in the interpunction of one word, קָחָה, first proposed by J. D. Michaelis, the parallelism is rendered complete and the meaning plain. So also Good, Noyes, Fry and Boothroyd.

V: 24.—C. V. And thou shalt visit thy habitation, and shalt not sin.

R. V. And shalt visit thy pastures, and miss nothing.

The changes here made are required by the context, and sustained by usage.

VI: 3.—C. V. Therefore my words are swallowed up.

R. V. For this cause, my words have been rash.

It is quite absurd to make Job say, as our translators do, that his words were swallowed up, i. e., that he could not find words to express his feelings, when at that very time he was giving vent to his feelings in the strongest terms.

VI: 13.—C. V. Is not thy help in me? And is wisdom driven quite from me?

R. V. Is not my help within me gone?  
And recovery driven away from me?

The meaning of this passage in the Common Version is quite unintelligible. The rendering of Dr. C. is plain, and free from all ambiguity. It is rendered in the same way substantially by Good, Noyes, Boothroyd, Barnes, and other English translators.

VI: 18.—C. V. The paths of their way are turned aside;  
They go to nothing and perish.

R. V. The caravans along their way, turn aside;  
They go up into the wastes, and perish.

According to our Common Version, the streams are here represented as turning aside from their usual course, and wandering about in the desert, making new channels for

themselves, until they diminish, and finally come to nothing. According to Dr. C., the caravans who follow the course of the streams, or cross them, turn aside in consequence of their being dried up, and leaving their direct route, in search of water, perish from thirst in the desert. We prefer the interpretation of Dr. C., which is also substantially that of Rosenmueller, Noyes and Umbreit. It avoids a repetition of the thought expressed in v. 17, and gives to the Hebrew noun, rendered *paths*, (אֶרְצוֹת) the same meaning which it confessedly has in v. 19, where it is rendered in our version *troops*. The very difficult passage, xix: 25—26, is thus rendered by Dr. C.:

“But I know my Redeemer lives,  
And in after time will stand upon the earth;  
And after this my skin is destroyed,  
And without my flesh, shall I see God.”

Job here expresses, according to Dr. Conant's version, not his persuasion that God will interpose and restore him to health again, as some suppose; nor that he will arise from the dead at the general resurrection, as is generally thought; but that he will receive, after the dissolution of his body, a just recompense in a future state. The passage then teaches the doctrine of a future state of retribution, but not a general resurrection. We do not think that Dr. Conant has been as happy in his translation of the prosaic portion of the book, as he has in the poetic. He has departed from the literal construction in many instances, by the omission of particles, which, though it may give a polish to his version, detracts from the simplicity of the original. Many verbal alterations seem to have been made from mere taste, or the love of change, which neither perspicuity nor fidelity to the original required. There is also a neglect of uniformity in the rendering of Hebrew words where the meaning is precisely the same, which by the way, seems to us a very serious blemish in our authorized version. The unnecessary multiplication of synonymes and equivalent expressions is, in our apprehension, a serious objection to any version of the Scriptures. We cite a few instances in illustration of our remarks:

I: 3; xlii: 12.—C. V. Sheep.

|

R. V. Sheep and goats.



Here Dr. Conant has given us three words for one in the original. Piscator has done the same in chap. i: 3; but in xlii: 2, he renders צֹאן, simply *oves*. The flocks of the Orientals, it is true, usually included *goats*. This is not, we think, a sufficient reason for the rendering here adopted. There are in Hebrew distinctive words for *sheep* and *goats*, and also for *flocks*; and to translate צֹאן *sheep and goats* is an interpretation or paraphrase, and not a simple version. The same word in the parallel passage, v. 16, should have been rendered, as in the Common Version, *sheep*, and not generically *flocks*. The word נֶקָר occurs four times in Job, and is uniformly rendered *ox* and *oxen*. But Dr. C. translates it *oxen* in chap. i: 3, and xlii: 12; *cattle* in chap. i: 14, and *herd* in chap. xl: 15. The word נְעָרִים occurs four times in the first chapter. Three times it is rendered *servants* in the Common Version, and also by Dr. C.; but in v. 19 they agree in rendering it *young men*. Noyes, also, has followed the authorized version in this respect, but, we think, not properly. No doubt *servants* are intended in verses 15, 16 and 17, but we gather this from the context, and not from the word itself; Luther, Calvin, Tremellius and Piscator agree in rendering it with uniform accuracy throughout. But we know of no English translator who has done this, except Prof. Lee.

In chap. i: 8, and ii: 3, Dr. Conant has 'like to him,' instead of 'like him' in the authorized version. Admitting that either is idiomatically correct, which of the two forms of expression is most commonly used? And what is gained by the change? Dr. C. has been severely censured in some quarters for his translation of בֵּרַךְ in chap. ii: 9, by *bless*, but the attacks made upon him for his departure from the Common Version in this passage, have certainly been characterized more by ignorance and prejudice, than by learning and candor. To *bless* is the ordinary signification of the Hebrew word, in which sense it occurs perpetually in the Old Testament. The word, moreover, is never translated in our Common Version *to curse*, except in four places in this book.—(i: 5—11, ii: 5—9.) And there are only three other passages in the Bible where it is supposed to have this meaning, viz: 1 Kings, xxi: 10—13; Ps. x: 3. In

Kings it is rendered in the Common Version to *blaspheme*, and in the Psalms to *bless*. No English translation with which we are acquainted, follows the authorized version in rendering it to *curse*, except that of Barnes. Nor does the word ever have that signification in any of the cognate dialects. But while we believe that the rendering to *curse* should be rejected as resting on no solid basis, we cannot agree with Dr. Conant, that in chap. ii : 9 the word should be translated to *bless*. It is the only passage where he has himself so rendered it, and here he does so simply on the ground that it is spoken *ironically*. This is certainly a possible sense. But it is not the obvious meaning. It is not that which would readily occur to the mind of the reader. It is not required or suggested by the context. But the signification to *renounce*, which Dr. C. has given to the word in chap. i : 11, and ii : 5, has this great advantage over every other which has been proposed—that it suits all the places where the word has been supposed to require the rendering to *curse* or to *blaspheme*.

Such translations of the books of Scripture and commentaries upon them as have appeared from the pens of Stuart, Turner, Noyes, Hodges, Barnes, Alexander, Hackett and Conant, do great honor to the Biblical scholarship of our country, and afford a pledge that we shall soon be behind no nation in Christendom in this department of literature.

---

#### ART. VI.—UNITARIANISM AND ITS TENDENCIES.

*Scripture Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism.* By JOHN WILSON. Third Edition. London : 1846.

As announced in our last paper, we propose at present, in the first place, to examine those passages in the New Testament which ascertain the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Wilson charges with “egregious

error" those Trinitarians, who apparently think it unnecessary to adduce evidence, but *assume* "that if the deity of Christ is founded on revelation, that of the Spirit will follow." We think this error not so egregious, as at first sight it may appear. For the great strength and chief refuge of the Socinian argument, lie in the appeal made to reason in behalf of the strict oneness of God, as opposed to a trinity of persons. Reason and nature proclaim that God is one; to this fact, falsely understood, the Unitarian flees, whenever he meets a passage inimical to his doctrine, or unusually difficult of favorable exposition. Of contented reliance upon this argument, in time of sorest need, we have exhibited at least one instance, on the part of Mr. Wilson, and could readily adduce very many more. Now this support, which we shall hereafter attempt to prove a "broken reed," is crushed at once, upon the establishment of Christ's divinity; for thus there would be displayed a duality in the Godhead, and therefore the whole fancied argument from reason, for the Socinian oneness of God, is swept away. Further, we think that the deity of Christ and that of the Holy Ghost are declared jointly by certain passages;—so intimately connected, that the demonstration of the one necessarily confirms the other. Of these we shall speak immediately.

We admit, however, that we are wholly indisposed to lay upon our former argument for the deity of Jesus Christ, any portion of the weight of further conclusions; as it is preferable to establish each element of the doctrine of the Trinity separately, in order that each may sustain, so far forth, every other, and that we may assume, in addition, the strong ground of the mutual fitness of these elementary parts, and their essential unity. Nevertheless, we are so convinced of that unity, and to such extent satisfied for one part to stand or fall with the others,—for the divinity of the Holy Ghost to rest, as for its evidences, upon the same foundation which upholds that of the Son of God,—that, for the most part, we shall content ourselves in the present section, with arguing from the one to the other. This we shall do in considering those clauses in which the three



persons of the Godhead are named. These are as follows :

(1.) "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

(2.) "... Jesus being baptized and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, like a dove, upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said: Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased."

(3.) "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all."\*

In (1) we find joined, in the solemn rite of baptism, the name of the Holy Ghost with those of the Father and the Son. If these latter are two persons of the Godhead, it seems a necessary consequence that the former can be nothing less in dignity and importance. The Unitarian exposition of the phrase "Holy Ghost," or "Holy Spirit," or "Spirit of God," gives it to mean, "the supernatural influences of the Deity on the minds of his servants, with the accompanying gifts and powers."—(Illustrations, &c., p. 97.) Undoubtedly this is frequently intended, corresponding to a similar use of the names of God and Christ; but that it is generally so, or so in the passage before us, we must be permitted to doubt. Accepting Mr. Wilson's explanation of the expression, "baptizing in (or, into) the name of" a person, as equivalent to "baptizing into the person himself," that is, "into a belief in him and his doctrines,"—it still seems no less inexplicable to us, that the name of an "influence" should here be found. This formula constitutes the initiatory confession of a new faith,—a faith unknown to the Jews. Hence the expression—"the name of the *Father and the Son*," instead of "God and the Christ," as indicating a newly asserted relation.

---

\* (1.) Matth. xxviii: 19; (2.) Luke, iii: 21—22; see, also, the parallel passages in Matth. iii: 16—17, and Mark, i: 10; (3.) 2 Cor. xiii: 14. We do not wish it understood that these are, in our opinion, all the passages in the New Testament of the class cited; but, simply, that they are all we may have space to examine.

What need of mention, then, of that influence of God upon the minds of his servants, so fully recognized by the Jews, in the inspiration of their prophets? How should this mark the peculiarity of the new faith? It may be replied, that this formula was to be used not simply among Jews, but in "all nations;" yet we should not forget that it was to have its beginning at Jerusalem, and that it was intended to define the fundamental creed of the new faith, as distinctly opposed to all others, Jewish and Pagan. Hence it is proper to render the passage before us as establishing baptism in the name of the holy Trinity,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;—the merciful Creator, Preserver and Protector of all, our Heavenly Father,—the Son of God, our divine Redeemer and Surety,—and the ministering Spirit, the Comforter and Sanctifier of our hearts.

The passage marked (2), ascertains fully the separateness of the three persons mentioned in (1). The Holy Spirit, Unitarians admit, sometimes indicates God, or rather, we should say, is called God; from which they insist that if a person, he is no otherwise so than as identical with the Father. But here we find the Holy Ghost *descending*, in a bodily shape, upon Jesus, whilst the Father, in the voice from heaven, acknowledges him to be his "beloved Son." We do not consider this passage as alone establishing the doctrine of the Trinity, though Mr. Wilson seems desirous to make us believe that Trinitarians so regard it. "Go, Arian! to the Jordan and see the Trinity," is a proper exhortation, for it does not necessarily imply that there alone is the Trinity to be discovered, but that the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Ghost being otherwise vindicated, we have here an instance in which the three persons of the Godhead appear *distinctively*.

In (3) we think the same distinction is set forth. The "grace of the Lord Jesus," the "love of God," the "communion of the Holy Ghost" are invoked by the apostle upon the Corinthians; the two former being blessings bestowed by *persons*, which favors the view that the latter also is. The word "communion" is rendered by some Unitarians "communication." Though this sense is that

most favorable to the Unitarian interpretation,—namely, that the apostle invoked from God the impartation of that holy influence, called the Spirit, to the minds of those to whom he writes,—yet it by no means militates against the sense we defend, namely, that Paul prayed to the Holy Ghost for the communication to them of his wonderful gifts. This view, moreover, is sustained by Paul's own words: "There are diversities of gifts, but the *same Spirit*,"—"to one is given *by the Spirit* the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge *by the same Spirit*; to another faith *by the same Spirit*; &c."—(1 Cor. xii: 4, 8, 9.) But it seems to us that *κοινωνία* is more allied in meaning to the sense conveyed by our word "fellowship," than to that of "communication." The latter meaning it may bear in some passages, (Philemon, 6; Rom. xv: 26,) but in a far larger number it undoubtedly obtains that of "fellowship." \* This sense, taken in the given connection, asserts fully the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost.

But if the doctrine of the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit can be established on independent grounds, it will go to sustain that of the deity of Christ, in that it will overthrow, in the manner we have already recited, the main Socinian argument from reason, and will in several passages, but especially in that marked (1) above, vindicate the dignity of Christ as co-equal with that of the Father and the Spirit. To demonstrate the personality of the Spirit, is, as we have already intimated, tantamount to the establishment of all for which we contend. The divinity of the Spirit, as identical with the Father, is generally admitted by Unitarians. Apart from this admission, however, we have the fullest evidence for it in the following passages:

"My Spirit," the Father himself says, "shall not always strive with man."—(Gen. vi: 3.) "Whither," asks the Psalmist, "shall I go from thy *Spirit*? or whither shall I flee from *thy presence*? If I ascend up into heaven, *thou*

---

\*Of these we cite a few: Acts, ii: 42; 2 Cor. vi: 14, and viii: 4; Gal. ii: 4; Eph. iii: 9; Phil. i: 5, ii: 1, ("fellowship of the Spirit,") and iii: 10; 1 John, i: 3, 6, 7. See also 1 Cor. i: 9, and x: 20; and Eph. v: 11.



art there," &c."—(Ps. cxxxix: 7—10.) "Why," asks Peter of Ananias, "why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" and in the next verse assures him, that "he has not lied unto men, but unto *God*."—(Acts, v: 3—4.) "Know ye not," writes Paul to the Corinthians, "that ye are the temple of *God*, and that the *Spirit of God* dwelleth in you?"\*—(1 Cor. iii: 16.)

We have, then, only to establish the *distinct personality* of the Spirit. In Acts, xiii: 2, we read that "as they ministered unto the Lord and fasted, the *Holy Ghost said*, separate me (*απολίστατε με*, separate unto me) Barnabas and Saul for the work *whereunto I have called them*." These must be the words of a personal agent speaking of himself. And that this person is distinct from the Father is evident, we think, from the simple consideration that had He been the speaker, the "voice from heaven" could hardly have failed to be noticed.

The words in Isaiah, xlvi: 16—"Now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me,"—no matter who may be the speaker, indicate a distinction between the "Lord God" and "his Spirit," as personal agents. The words should probably be thus rendered: "Now the Lord God hath sent me, and his Spirit." Some Unitarians contend that we should read "*with* his Spirit," as the copulative *Vav* sometimes may bear that sense. Though this rendering be accepted, the construction of the original still exhibits the Spirit as a co-agent with Jehovah, and, therefore, a person distinct from, as well as one with the Father.

But in the twelfth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, we think there is indisputable proof of the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost. We read there that "there are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and

---

\* "If," says Augustine, "we were commanded to build a temple of wood and stone to the Holy Ghost, this would be a plain proof of his divinity, because this act of worship is due to God alone; how much plainer then is the proof of it, that we are not to build a temple to him, but to be ourselves his temple?"—[AP. PICTET, CHAP. 12; P. 110, SUB FIN.]

there are diversities of operations, but [it is\*] the same God, which worketh all in all."—(vs. 4—6.) This clause might have been cited above, as containing reference to the three persons of the Godhead, but is more suitably discussed here. We need not pause to inquire whether the last clause was intended to apply to each of the others, thus affirming the Spirit and the Lord to be God, or not. Our wish is to show that the Spirit is here spoken of as having a *distinct* work,—the bestowal of gifts.† Now, in the eleventh verse of this same chapter, we find the strongest testimony to his personality, which occurring in such connection, must avail to establish his *distinct personality*. After more fully displaying the nature of the gifts of the Spirit, Paul concludes by saying: "But all these worketh that *one and self-same Spirit*, dividing to every man severally *as he will* (βουλεται)." This is a positive assertion of his personality; but Unitarians attempt to break its force by explaining the clause as containing a personification,‡ and refer, in defence of this interpretation, to the words of Jesus to Nicodemus—"the wind bloweth where it *listeth* (θελει),"—where, say they, a similar argument would deduce the personality of the wind. So argues Mr. Wilson, without the slightest reference to the fact that different words are here used, of which βουλεσθαι is unquestionably that which has the *strongest* signification, never in the New Testament, we believe, being used in the weaker sense of "wishing, desiring, being willing," which expresses the proper force of θελει. The former has always the sense of our verb "to will," except where it ascends into the stronger derivative signification of "decreeing, determining; whilst θελει is properly translated, in many cases, "to desire, be willing," sometimes reaching the sense "to will." In the passage above, then, which refers to the wind, the translation "bloweth

---

\* This word, εστι, is certainly spurious. See Griesbach and others.

† Which is further specified in the verses following; some of which we quoted supra.

‡ Which must be understood to be one of which St. Paul is fond,—continuing it through this whole chapter, and often reverting to it elsewhere.

where it listeth," or "where it pleaseth," is correct, but can afford no support to the view which finds a personification in the clause from Paul's epistle.

There is another passage that ought to be prominently adduced in this controversy, since it emphatically distinguishes the personality of the Spirit from that of the Father. In Romans, viii: 26, we read: "Likewise the Spirit helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." This could not, we think, be said of an influence or emanation. But the apostle continues in the next verse (and it is to this we especially referred) as follows: "And *he that searcheth the hearts* knoweth what is the *mind of the Spirit*, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." Here are God the Father, and the Spirit spoken of as two distinct existences, and of the latter it is affirmed that he has a "mind," the word for which in the original (*φρονημα*), though not equivalent to that for "intellect" (*νοος*), is yet expressive of a strictly personal attribute, such as "opinion," "thought," "desire or will." This passage alone, therefore, establishes all for which we are here contending.

We shall close our remarks upon this portion of the subject, by quoting the words of John Owen, without intending to adopt his sarcastic and somewhat uncharitable delineation of our opponents:

"If a wise and honest man should come and tell you, that in a certain country where he has been, there is an excellent governor, who wisely discharges the duties of his office; who hears causes, discerns right, distributes justice, relieves the poor, and comforts the distressed; would you not believe that he intended by this description, a righteous, wise, diligent, intelligent person? What else could any man living imagine? But now suppose that a stranger, or person of suspicious character and credit, should come and say that the former information which you had received was indeed true, but that no man or person was intended, but the sun, or the wind, which, by their benign influences, rendered the country fruitful and temperate, and disposed the inhabitants to mutual kindness and benignity; and therefore that the whole description of a governor and his actions was merely figurative, though no such intimation had been given you. Must you not conclude, either that the first person was a notorious trifier, and designed your ruin, if your affairs depended on his report, or that your latter informer, whose veracity you had reason to suspect, had endeavored to abuse both him and you? It is exactly thus in



the case before us. The Scripture tells us, that the Holy Ghost governs the Church; appoints overseers of it; discerns and judges all things; comforts the faint; strengthens the weak; is grieved and provoked by sin; and that in these and many other affairs, he works, orders, and disposes all things according to the counsel of his own will. Can any man credit this testimony, and conceive otherwise of the Spirit, than as a holy, wise, intelligent person? Now while we are under the power of these apprehensions, there come to us some men, Socinians or Quakers, whom we have just cause to suspect of deceit and falsehood; and they tell us that what the Scripture says of the Holy Ghost is indeed true, but that no such person is intended by these expressions, but only an accident, a quality, an effect, or influence of the power of God, which doth all these things figuratively; that he has a will figuratively, an understanding figuratively, is sinned against figuratively; and so of all that is said of him. Now what can any man, not bereft of natural reason, as well as spiritual light, conclude, but either that the Scripture designed to draw him into fatal errors, or that those who impose such a sense upon it are corrupt seducers, who would rob him of his faith and comforts?" \*

With this extract we close the present argument, conceiving that such are the enunciations of Revelation, as to establish, beyond reasonable dispute, the doctrine of the Trinity,—“three persons, but one God:”

“Tres-unus Deus; unus actus,  
Una natura est tribus; una virtus,  
Una majestas, Deitas et una,  
Gloria et una.  
Una vis immensa, perennis una  
Vita, lux una, et sapientia una,  
Una mens, una et ratio, una vox, et  
Una voluntas.” †

In the next place we come to make some inquiry into some clauses of Holy Writ, which, on Unitarian exegesis, present themselves as opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity. We shall first examine that passage, which is chiefly relied on by Unitarians, as showing that Christ does not possess an essential attribute of Deity,—occurring in Mark, xiii: 32. “But of that day,” says Jesus himself, to his disciples in reference to the time of his coming, “and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels who are in heaven, *neither the*

---

\*On the Holy Ghost, chap. iv. We append a list of texts, supporting the assertions here made of the Holy Ghost, and being, most probably, those to which the author had special reference:—Acts, xiii: 2, xx: 28, xv: 28, xvi: 6—7; 1 Cor. ii: 10—11; John, xiv: 26, xvi: 7—11; Rom. viii: 26; Eph. iv: 30; Acts, v: 9, vii: 59; Isa. lxiii: 10; &c.

† George Herbert, Mus. Respons.; Works, p. 433.

*Son*, but the Father.” This passage has given rise to much discussion, and no little ingenious criticism on the part of Trinitarians, in order to explain its apparent inconsistency with their belief in the omniscience of the Son of God. We cannot pause even to notice these; but will state at once what we think to be the true exposition of the passage. Christ was “very man;” this is admitted by all;—further, we believe him to be truly God. But as *man* he was regarded by his disciples at the time of the discourse, in which the cited clause occurs. As *man* he was naturally regarded by the Jews; and in his teachings, always where such a course was not hostile to the elucidation of truth, he accommodated himself to this view of his nature. It would have been subversive of his other aims, to have ever been anxious to warn his hearers of his two-fold nature, where that nature had no necessary bearing upon, or relation to the matter in hand. This consideration furnishes the key to such passages as follow:

“My doctrine is not mine,”—that is, not the doctrine of a mere man, as ye Jews take me to be, and have just said I am (v. 15),—“but his that sent me.” (John, vii: 16.)—“The word which you hear is not mine, but the Father’s who sent me.” (John, xiv: 24.)—“I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.” (John, viii: 28,—in which verse he speaks of himself as the *Son of man*.)—“But now ye seek to kill me, a *man* that hath told you the truth which I have heard of God.”

So, in the clause under consideration, we should understand that Christ is speaking of himself in accommodation to the views of his nature entertained by his disciples. “In those days,” are his literal words, “after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the *Son of man* coming in the clouds with great power and glory. \* \* \* But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels which are in heaven, nor the *Son*, but the Father.” Here he is clearly speaking of

himself as the *Son of man*, which phrase, Unitarians themselves insist, frequently means no more than "*man*." Invariably when announcing his *coming*, he speaks of himself as the *Son of man*,\* and therefore with special reference to his humanity, as if intending to call attention emphatically to this "coming in power and great glory" as a conspicuous manifestation of that state of exaltation to which, as Paul says (Philip. ii: 9), God hath raised him as a reward due to the humility, in which he "took upon him the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." And it is here worthy of remark that Christ, also, in speaking of the death he was to undergo, and of the resurrection which was to glorify his humanity, always designates himself in that connection as the *Son of man*.† There would be nothing surprising or unexpected, we may add, in the Son of God coming in power and glory, but such an appearance of a son of man is an evidence of exalted honor‡ worthy of emphatic presentation. As a Son of man his disciples understood him to speak;—as a man no otherwise different from themselves, than as the sent of God, and as more highly endowed than any other Messenger of God with the Holy Spirit, and with power and knowledge. As such in their eyes, he predicts the signs of his coming; and as such he professes that he knows not the day nor hour in which he will appear. As the Son of man, as the man sent from God to teach the gospel to a fallen world, it comes not within the sphere of his humanity nor of his delegated powers, to foretell more accurately than he just had done, the time of his coming;—for only the vague and awful indications of that time, which he had specified, were calculated

---

\* See the parallel passages to that above quoted in Matth. xxiv: 27—44, and Luke xxi: 27—36. See, also, Matth. x: 23; xvi: 27—28; xxv: 31; xxvi: 64; Mark viii: 38; xiv: 62; Luke ix: 26; xii: 40; xvii: 24—30; xviii: 8; xxii: 69.

† See Matth. xii: 40; xvii: 9, 22, 23; xx: 18; Mark viii: 31; ix: 9—31; x: 33—34; Luke ix: 22, &c.

‡ Cf. John v: 26—27:—"The Father . . . hath given him authority to execute judgment, also, because he is the Son of man."



to move the hearts and fix the deep attention of his hearers, —an effect which would have been destroyed, or at least essentially lessened, by the satisfaction of their curiosity as to the exact day, but which was as much heightened by the impenetrable secrecy surrounding a fact known to no man, nor even to the angels of heaven, nor to himself, as the Son of man, the sent of God. This was one of the “times and seasons, which the Father has put into his own power,” or, jurisdiction (Acts, i: 7), and which, therefore, it was not for his hearers to know, and which he, as their teacher, knew not. But we cannot from this deduce absolute ignorance on the part of Christ, concerning the time in question, in his essential intelligence or divine essence,—any more than we can infer the lack of an essential attribute of infinite intelligence in the Father, because he “judgeth no one, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.”—(John, v: 22.) Evidently the Father is here represented as not judging in his *capacity as Governor* of the universe. This duty has been placed under the jurisdiction of the Son;—but surely we do not conclude that the Father does not judge in his essential intelligence.

A similar exposition, we think, is proper for the passage in which Jesus says: “My Father is greater than I.”—(John, xiv: 28.) He is here speaking of his departure, the time of which was drawing near, and comforting his disciples. On the going out of Judas from the supper, having eaten the sop after which “Satan entered into him,” Jesus announces that the “*Son of man* is glorified,” (xiii: 31),—glorified in the approaching death and resurrection of his human body. In the course of his speaking thus as a man, being engaged in more fully announcing the fact of his death, and in administering comfort to his disciples, he says:—“Ye have heard how I said unto you, *I go away and come again unto you*. If you loved me ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father, for my Father is greater than I,”—greater than you see me now to be. “It is my Father,” he seems to say, “who will, when I go unto him, and have finished this sorrowful life, exalt me to be a Prince and Saviour; and ye would rejoice on this account, if ye loved me.”

A clause *apparently* similar to this just noticed occurs in John x: 29: "My Father who gave them me is *greater than all* (*παιτων*); and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." Either blindly or unfairly Mr. Wilson, and Unitarians generally, adduce this passage to prove the essential supremacy of the Father over Christ. The phrases *all* and *all things* are not always used in an absolute sense in the New Testament, but are often limited in their signification by their context. This limited sense, even where there is nothing in the context to warrant the limitation, Mr. Wilson is not slow to perceive and contend for, when discussing such expressions as the following: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given *all things* (*παντα*) into his hand;" (John iii: 35;) "All things that the Father hath, are mine;" (John xvi: 15;) and " . . . His Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things; (*παιτων*, of all;) by whom also he made the worlds."—(Heb. i: 2.) In the clause under consideration, it is evident that Jesus means by the word "all"—*all enemies* of his disciples,—all who might desire to pluck them out of his own or his Father's hand.

In coming, in the next place, to treat of the argument from reason, we do so with our already expressed belief, that the nature of an infinite being lies mostly beyond the reach of human understanding. Reason and revelation, as we have before said, unite to assert the oneness of the Divine Mind; but if revelation assures us that in the Deity three persons or hypostases exist, it ill behooves the puny intellect of man to call the truth in question, or to affirm that the doctrine implies a contradiction. On the other hand, it must lie beyond the province of human intellect to demonstrate that reason does itself enounce this doctrine, and that any other constitution of the Divine Nature is impossible. This some have sought to do, among whom we may name Poiret,—but we cannot consider the proof as positive or satisfactory in any degree. In the words of Bishop Burnet: "It is a vain attempt to go about to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by reason; for it must be confessed, that we should have had no cause to have thought of any such

thing, if the Scriptures had not revealed it to us.”\* On the other hand, objections to the doctrine, from reason, are but worse, as unsupported by revelation, and on both it is “very unmeet,” as Baxter observes, “in these tremendous mysteries to go farther than we have God’s own light to guide us.” What reasoning can show that there cannot be *three distinct, but not separate*, persons in one Godhead? To attempt to deduce such impossibility from the consideration of the oneness of God, is absurd, since God *must* be essentially one for the doctrine of the Trinity to be true. The essential idea of *personality* cannot be shown to require or include *separateness* of nature, and hence there can arise no dilemma of a single person in the Godhead, on the one hand, or Tritheism, on the other, for a Trinitarian.

The union of the divine and human natures in Christ, is a subject of much offense to the *rational* Unitarian. This is said to be against reason, and to abstract from the example set by Christ, all that makes it conformable to our state and circumstances. It is proclaimed that to make the announcement that, “we have not an high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities,” but one who “was *in all points tempted like as we are*, yet without sin,” is a mockery of human weakness, as adducing the case of one, who amid his temptations (if he can at all be said to have been tempted) had sources of support, of which mere men are necessarily deprived. As to this union of the divine and human natures, so inscrutable to reason, we have only to say, that it is a mystery no greater than many which continually present themselves. It is no more wonderful than the union of the mind and body in man. It is no more wonderful than the existence of those two natures in Paul, when unregenerate, of which he speaks as follows:—“If then *I do* what *I would not*, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more *I* that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in *me* (that is, *in my flesh*,) dwelleth no good thing; for to

---

\* Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Art. I., p. 36; London, 1819.



*will is present with me ; but (how) to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not : but the evil which I would not that I do.*"—(Rom. vii : 16—20.)

Now here we find two natures (two *opposing* natures, moreover,) dwelling in the same individual ; and he, in speaking of them, does continually identify each with his personality. May we not hence infer the possibility of a union of the divine with the human nature in their total essence within the sphere of one personality ? And if Paul could separate the two natures within him, and properly identify, on occasion, himself with each, so certainly can the two natures in Christ each separately accomplish its peculiar destination, and fulfil its own tendencies. In his human nature, then, he could be "tempted in all points like as we are," and could approve himself "without sin," though unassisted by his divinity in preserving his purity.\* For thus the conscientious spirit of Paul enabled him to will the good, unassisted, and indeed wholly opposed by the "law in his members," just as the latter manifested itself in the "evil which he did" in opposition to the will of his better nature.

As to Christ's mysterious union with the Father, we are content to quote the words of Irenæus. "If any one," says he, "asks us, how is the Son produced from the Father, we tell him that whether it be called *generation*, *nuncupation*, or *adapertion*, or by whatever other name this ineffable generation be called, *no one knows it* ; neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor Saturnius, nor Basilides, nor Angels, nor Archangels, nor Principalities, nor Powers ;

---

\* There is a sufficiently curious (and equally deplorable) evidence of the tendency of the human mind to distort all circumstances into some sort of support for its beliefs, in the pertinacious exhibition, by Mr. Wilson and others, of the death of Jesus as an argument against his divinity. He suffered death, therefore he was not possessed of immortality ; —such is the *enthymeme* incessantly rung in one's ears by Unitarian writers. But the suppressed premise fails. *There lies a gigantic error* ; —that the fact of death renders impossible the attribute of immortality. Were this true, the soul of man would have no existence after death. But *death* is of the body, not of the soul ; and just as certainly as the soul is unaffected by the death of the body, so certainly the fact of the death of Christ's body invalidates, in no possible respect, his claim to the attribute of immortality.

*but only the Father who begat, and the Son who is begotten."* \*

Let us now interrogate the history of the early Church, to ascertain the opinion held by it upon this subject. Unfortunately the records of the doctrines of the Church in the times immediately succeeding the apostolic age are few and scanty. Dr. Priestley has labored to show that the Unitarian doctrine was that of the primitive Church, though compelled to admit that when we descend to times of which we have reliable historical records, we find the heresy of Trinitarianism rather widely spread.† During the apostolic age,—as many passages in the New Testament give evidence,—heresies arose in the Christian Church. These were of two opposite kinds, the Judaistic and the Gnostic. The former, which is the older, was the result of a too strict adherence to the letter of the law. This sect received Jesus as the promised Messiah, but at the same time considered him a mere man, as he was bodied forth in the common expectation of their countrymen, the Jews. All the divine attributes belonging to the Savior they referred to the descent of the Holy Ghost upon him at his baptism. Some, however, contended that it was a Spirit,—the highest of the angels of God,—which here descended upon him, and that this Spirit was the true Messiah. Thus this sect, in its extreme, tends towards and coalesces,‡ in fact, with one division of the opposing sect of Gnostics. Another division of the latter, the Docetæ, held that the humanity of Christ was a mere myth;—the form in which he appeared, simply a vision. Cerinthus, who was cotemporary with John, combined these doctrines, or rather adopted each partially. In his views of the relation of the supreme God with the world, he follows the doctrines of the Gnostics; but in his

---

\* Lib. ii., cap. xlviii.

† Hist. Corruptions of Christianity; vol. i., sec. i., sub. fin.; p. 12 Boston, 1797.

‡ Not all, however, of this sect, who were inaccurately classed together under the title of *Ebionites*, held these doctrines; but some, indeed, admitted the miraculous conception, and therefore most probably the proper divinity of Jesus.

Christology, accepts the teachings of the Ebionites as a foundation. He considered Jesus as first endowed with divine attributes on the descent of the Holy Ghost at Jordan. And he regarded the Holy Ghost as the true Christ, the heavenly Christ (*ὁ ἀπὸ Χριστός*). The man Jesus was, in his view, only the vehicle through which the true Christ manifested himself. He called the man Jesus the earthly Christ (*ὁ κατὰ Χριστός*), it is true, yet he was no otherwise Christ, than as the organ of the true, the heavenly Christ.

Now Irenæus, who wrote about 150 A. D., asserts on the credit of reports received from the disciples of John, "that Cerinthus was a cotemporary of that apostle, and was combated by him." \* The treatise called the "First Epistle General" of John, seems partly designed to denounce the heresy propagated by this man. Dr. Priestley, however, in speaking of the two great opposing heresies of the Docetæ and the Ebionites,—the former teaching that Christ is God, but that he was not man, the latter that he was man, but is not God,—says that the latter was no heresy at all, as may be inferred from John's silence with reference to it, whilst censuring the doctrine of the Docetæ. "And that this," he continues, "was the only heresy that gave him any alarm, is evident from his first epistle, chap. iv : 2—3, where he says that *every spirit which confesses that Jesus is come in the flesh* (by which he must have meant, in opposition to the Gnostics, *is truly a man*) *is of God*. On the other hand, he says, *every spirit which confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God, and this is the spirit of Anti-Christ whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world.*"

Unfortunately for this arch of reasoning, the key-stone fails. The words "is come in the flesh," in the second clause quoted, "are wanting in A (the Alexandrian MS.), B, (the Vatican), several others, both the Syriac, the Polyglott, Arabic, Æthiopic, Coptic, Armenian and Vulgate; in Origen, Cyril, Theodoret, Irenæus, and others. Griesbach has left them out of the text."

---

\* Neander, Hist. Christ. Relig. and Church, sec. iv; vol. i., p. 396.



That clause, therefore, is to be read, "every spirit which confesses not Jesus, is not of God," and this includes, of course, all enemies of the true faith, whether Docetæ, or Cerinthians, or Ebionites, and, therefore, the designation of *Anti-Christ* can be attributed to neither singly.

But again, that this was *not* "the only heresy which gave him alarm," John shows in four other passages of the same epistle. In chap. ii: 18—23, we read: "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that Anti-Christ shall come, *even now are there many Anti-Christ*s; whereby we know it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us. . . . But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth. *Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is Anti-Christ that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. . . .*" Now the proposition, "Jesus is *the Christ*," is the negative of the doctrine of the Cerinthians, and of that branch of the Ebionites who taught a similar system. With these, Jesus was *not* the true, the divine Christ. But John here denounces their faith as a lie, virtually asserting, therefore, the divinity of Jesus, and adding with emphasis, that "he is Anti-Christ that denieth the Father and the Son," that is, that denies the relation of the Father and the Messiah in the Godhead,—to which, he proceeds to say that the denial of the Son,—of Jesus, as a divine person,—is tantamount. In chap. iv: 15, are these words: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is *the Son of God*, God dwelleth in him and he in God." Likewise in chap. v: 1, and 4—5: "Whosoever shall confess that *Jesus is the Christ*, is born of God;" and, "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world. . . . Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" Thus we find that whilst John in this epistle mentions the heresy of the Docetæ once, he refers no less than four times to those of the Cerinthians and Ebionites, as denying the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus.

Opposing, therefore, as he did, the doctrine which makes Jesus a mere man, as well as that which beholds him as only God, what, in the view of the apostle, is the truth,—what *can it be*, but that Christ is truly man and truly God? And this doctrine was handed down from John, the last of the apostles, to his successors, as we shall show by the following extracts from various writers.

There are extant several epistles attributed to the “apostolical Fathers,” of which, doubtless, the great majority are either spurious or ruinously interpolated. But the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, one of the earliest Fathers, being cotemporary with Peter, Paul and John,—addressed to the Corinthians, is pronounced by many, among whom is Dr. Priestley, to be genuine. Now, though the purposes of the writer necessitated no declaration of the sort, we think there are two passages establishing the writer’s faith in the pre-existence of Christ. One is as follows: “But all these things must be confirmed by the faith which is in Christ; for so he himself bespeaks us by the Holy Ghost. Come ye children, and hearken unto me, and I will teach you the fear of the Lord.”\* Christ is here represented as dictating, by the Holy Spirit, the words which are found in a Psalm of David.—(See Ps. xxxiv: 11.) Hence the writer must have understood that he existed before he “was made man.” The other passage referred to is the following: “For Christ is theirs who are humble, and not theirs who exalt themselves over his flock. The sceptre of the majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the show of pride and arrogance, *though he could have done so* (καίπερ δυναμενος); but with humility, as the Holy Ghost had before spoken concerning him.”† This evidently implies our Savior’s power to elect what appearance and mode of life he should adopt on earth, and consequently his pre-existence. “The passage, however,” says Dr. Priestly, “is explained, by supposing that Clemens alluded to Christ’s coming as a *public teacher*, when, being invested with the power of working

---

\* 1 Epist. to the Corinthians, chap. x: 1—2. Archbp. Wake, Tr.

† Id. ch. vii: 1.

mîracles, he never made any ostentatious display of it, or indeed exerted it for his own benefit in any respect. If we consider the prophecies which Clemens quotes, we shall find them to be not such as describe the circumstances of the *birth* of Christ, but only those of his *public life* and *death*.\* This "easy explanation" is unfortunate, in that the assertion upon which it is built is not true. The first and longest quotation is from Isa. liii, and it is thus introduced by Clemens, in the verse immediately succeeding the one above cited: "For thus he saith, Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? For *he shall* GROW UP before him as a *tender plant*, and as a *root out of a dry ground*: he hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." Now, here is evident reference to his birth and extraction, as preceding his public life, when, as the prophet proceeds to say, he shall be "despised and rejected of men." So that the choice which he had was not restricted to his public career, but embraced his *whole condition of life* from birth to death, and therefore implies his pre-existence.

Jerome, instead of *καίπερ δυναμενος*, reads, *παντα δυναμενος*, *having power over all things*, or *having all power*, which "more ancient reading" Dr. Priestley, singularly enough, considers as "evidently favorable" to the interpretation he has given to Clemens' words,—since they "naturally allude to the great power of which Christ became possessed" after his baptism. But we have shown that the reference of Clemens is to the whole life of Jesus, and as the clause would read after this change,—"*came not in the show of pride and arrogance, though having all power*,"—the inference is inevitable, that not only his pre-existence is here asserted, but possibly also his omnipotence, unless we restrict the latter clause to mean,—"*though having all power to do so*,"—as it may. If simply a public teacher, a mere man, though endowed with power and knowledge by the Holy

---

\*Hist. of Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ, book i., ch. i.; vol. 1, pp. 94—95. Birmingham, 1786.



Ghost, Christ could have had no right or power to assume any method of using his gifts, which would avail to surround himself with ostentatious splendors. For those gifts were bestowed for a special end, he was "sent into the world" for a fixed purpose, which would have been utterly subverted by any resplendent display. So much, we think, can be safely assumed, in view of the fact that a totally opposite course, for the accomplishment of that end, was adopted under the direction of Supreme Wisdom. It follows, that if he were a mere teacher, the assertion of Clemens as to Christ's power of choice is false, and evidently so. Hence we conclude, that Clemens not only virtually asserts Christ's pre-existence, but does so in such way as to indicate a belief on his own part in the divinity of the Savior.

Without pausing to give any testimonies derived from the writings attributed to Barnabas, to Ignatius, to Polycarp, and to Hermas, as all subject to well supported objections, on the ground either of the spurious or the corrupted character of their works,—we append an extract from a letter of the church at Smyrna to other churches, on the death of Polycarp, which occurred in 167 A. D. Speaking of the accusation brought against them by the Jews of the city, that now "forsaking the crucified" they would worship Polycarp, the church says:

"They (the Jews) did not consider that neither can we ever forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of such as shall be saved throughout the whole world, nor worship any other; for *Him*, indeed, as *Son of God*, we worship; but the martyrs, as disciples and followers of the Lord, we only love, because of their surpassing affection for our only King and Master."\*

These are the words of Christians who were instructed and governed by a disciple of John. As further proving these to have been the doctrines of the apostles, we shall cite Irenæus, who was martyred A. D. 202. He in his youth

---

\*Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., Lib. iv., ch. 15.

had seen and heard Polycarp, as he himself records in a letter to the false teacher Florinus.

“These are not, O Florinus,” he writes, “to speak briefly, the doctrines of a sound mind; . . . these doctrines, the elders who preceded us, who also associated with the apostles, did not teach you. For whilst I was yet a boy, I saw you in Asia (Minor), in company with Polycarp; . . . for I call to mind what then happened, better than what is recent. What is learned in youth grows along with the soul, and becomes one with it; so that I can tell the place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit and teach; and his going in and out; and his manner of life; and the form of his person; and the discourses which he delivered to the people; how he told of his intercourse with John, and with others who had seen the Lord, and how he reported their sayings, and whatever he had heard from them respecting the Lord, his miracles and his doctrines. Polycarp related all in accordance with the Scripture, as he had received from the eye-witnesses of the life of the Word. These things even then, through the mercy of God vouchsafed to me, I listened to with eagerness, not writing down their memorials upon paper, but sinking them in my heart; and by the grace of God I continually ruminate upon them.”\*

Thus taught by one, who himself devotedly adhered to all the apostles delivered,—the opinions of Irenæus are surely of great value in the present question, especially as he approves himself throughout his writings as one opposed to schism and innovation, and therefore as one attached to the original unity and apostolic doctrines of the Church. He bears full and frequent testimony to the deity of Christ. He tells us that the Son of God brought “salvation to his own creature;” and that Christ “united man to God” by partaking, as he proceeds to explain, of the nature of both.†

Thus we find the doctrine, which we proved above from his own words to be that of John, through two unimpeachable witnesses faithfully handed down. A doctrine thus

---

\* Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. Lib. v, c. 20.

† Lib. iii., c. 18

delivered cannot be idolatrous and false, but must be "the truth of God."

A writer (commonly supposed to have been Caius) in opposing the Artemonites at Rome, who asserted Christ to be a mere man, holds the following language:

"Who does not know the works of Irenæus, and Melito, and the rest, which declare Christ to be God and man? And how many psalms and hymns, written by faithful brethren from the beginning, celebrate Christ, the Word of God, as being God."\* So, also Pliny the younger tells us that the Christians, who were accused before him, affirmed that they "sang hymns to Christ as to a god."†

Justin Martyr, who as a writer preceded Irenæus a few years, bears emphatic testimony to the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity.‡

Thus we find valuable testimony defending the integrity of the doctrine which, through Irenæus, Polycarp has delivered to us from John. Irenæus lived to the close of the second century, and delivered the true doctrine into the hands of Origen, Clemens of Alexandria, and Tertullian. Whatever errors they may have committed in their attempts to explain the doctrine, their pages bear abundant witness to the truth, that "the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, three persons, make one God," which belief, Tertullian says, "had come down to them from the beginning of the gospel."§ During the third century and the beginning of the fourth, Cyprian, Novatian, Dionysius of Alexandria, Firmilian, Arnobius and Eusebius, stand forth as witnesses to the same faith; and at the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, Arius was strongly censured by the almost unanimous voice of the assembled bishops. So that from this time no one can deny that the doctrine of the Trinity was the public faith of the Church. Indeed, we think we have shown that from the days of the apostles till the Council of Nice, as well as since that time, the Church, as a body, believed and taught the doctrine, as do now the vast majority of professed Christians.

\* In Eusebius. † Lib. x., Epist. xcvii. ‡ Vid. Dial. cum Tryph. Jud. 248.

§ Ad. Prax., c. 2 and 31.



And it is no weak argument for the Trinitarian faith, which can be deduced from this *generality* of the belief. For this is a direct pledge *for* the truth, and *against* the error of the doctrine. And this argument cannot be rebutted by the statement, that one similar to it, and as weighty, lay against infant Christianity, in behalf of Paganism. For Paganism was not one, but many. Trinitarianism, if untrue, is idolatry. To explain the exchange of Christianity for this idolatry must ever prove a hopeless task for the Unitarian, on account of the unparalleled prevalence of this perverted belief. In view of so wide a diffusion of error, we may well exclaim in the words of the eloquent Massillon, in speaking of Christ:

“O ye! who refuse him his glory and his divinity, and who yet regard him as the messenger of God to instruct mankind,—complete the blasphemy, and confound him, then, with those impostors who come to seduce the world; since far from re-establishing therein the glory of God and the knowledge of his name,—the splendor of his ministry has served only to erect himself into a divinity, only to place him calamitously at the side of the Most High, and to plunge the whole world into the most dangerous, the most continued, the most inevitable, and the most universal of all idolatries.”\*

Briefly now as to the tendencies of Unitarian doctrine. If Jesus Christ were a mere man, in no way, as we have seen, could he constitute a due sacrifice for the sins of mankind, and, therefore, on the Socinian view, the great doctrine of atonement, which we consider fundamental, must prove nugatory. For being a man only, himself would have been “under the law,” and therefore unable to suffer vicariously for mankind. He was “without sin” it is true; but as “debtor to do the whole law,” this were sufficient to secure only his own immunity from punishment. Thus we should be left to depend upon our own works for salvation;—and the life and death of Jesus have no other signi-

---

\*Sermon sur la Divin. de J. C., Œuvres compl., Tom. prem., p. 403; Paris, 182.

ficance than as an example for us, and as certifying a resurrection from the dead, and a future life.

We cannot, here, enter upon any discussion of the doctrine of atonement. All Scripture abounds with testimonies to the fact that Christ is "the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."—(1 John ii: 2.) A denial of this doctrine subverts the very foundations of the Christian faith. For faith in Christ is thus reduced to a mere belief in the resurrection and in a future life, which many held before Christ came. We are saved, say the Unitarians, on reformation of life, by the *free grace* of God, "without regard to any foreign consideration whatever." So says Dr. Priestley,\* laying great stress upon the use of the word *freely* in Rom. iii: 24, without referring to the conditioning clause attached:—"Being justified freely," is the clause, "by his grace, through (*δία*, on account of,) the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." If we are forgiven, as they insist, by the free grace of God, then, as Paul shows from the very terms, it is not on account of our works. "To him that worketh," he says, "is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." But by this inconsistent system of belief, works are put forward as a claim upon the *free* grace of God for forgiveness. But never yet have works, resulting from personal reformation of life,—a reformation not founded on the pardon of our transgressions through Christ's mediation,—lifted the burden of past sins from the heart, or availed to "minister to a mind diseased." Only he,—who looks to the Cross of Christ, with Paul, as that by which he is reconciled to God, and has faith in Christ as the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world," can feel that "peace which passeth all understanding." He only can say to a troubled conscience:—

"I have physick to expell thee.  
And the receipt shall be  
My Savior's blood: whenever at his board  
I do but taste it, straight it cleanseth me,  
And leaves thee not a word." †

---

\* Hist. Corruptions of Christianity, Part ii., sec. 4.

† George Herbert, Conscience; Works, p. 107.

But the very name of *Savior* is, on the Socinian view, as applied to Christ's relation to mankind, a hollow mockery.

Another tendency of Unitarian doctrine is to weaken the vigor which rightly should characterize that essential manifestation of Christianity,—the missionary spirit. Such is the result logically consequent upon the interpretation, (noticed in the last number of the Review,) which is given by Unitarians to the command and promise of the Savior, in connection with the propagation of the gospel. "Go ye, therefore," are his words, "and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—(Matth. xxviii: 19—20.) We have seen that to receive this, as Trinitarians do, for a command, accompanied by a promise, which is addressed through the apostles to his disciples in all time, is virtually to acknowledge the omnipresence of Christ. This, of course, Unitarians cannot do, and hence are forced to interpret the passage as applying solely to those directly addressed, and the promise as holding only until the destruction of Jerusalem. Thus is lost to them the command upon which especially is founded the obligation, on the part of Christians, to propagate the gospel. Without direct command to sustain it, the missionary spirit, though essential to the nature of Christianity, cannot be supported among a people. The Unitarians of the United States do, we believe, maintain one or two missions, but their zeal in this cannot be that of one obeying the last command of a parting Saviour. Only a belief in the brotherhood and common destiny of man, or an attempt to fulfil prophecy, or a conviction that such is a requisition arising out of the very nature of Christianity, can prompt them to the work. Neither the missionaries nor their supporters, can be sustained by a sense of acting in obedience to a direct command, and of being placed in a position to appropriate a positive promise of the Saviour of the world; and inevitably, the missionary spirit among them must languish always, and may wholly expire.

Furthermore, Unitarianism must ever, as opposed to the



belief of the vast majority of professed Christians, present itself, in the consciousness of each of its disciples, under the form of a disputation theology. This must be so, even in the very unusual case, where the person holding it does not enter actively into any discussion of his creed. Thus, then,—as, also, because it must for the same reason be one of the main employments of their preachers,—every Unitarian must make it a prominent part of his meditations to collect arguments and develop modes of reasoning, for the purpose of depreciating the dignity of one whom they acknowledge to be the Lord and Christ; and of proving his lack of any just claim to the title of Savior. This tendency and its results are rankly displayed in the following words of one of their ministers:—"Whether the perfection of Christ's character, in public life, (as recorded by the evangelists,) combined with the general declarations of his freedom from sin, establish, or were intended to establish the fact that Jesus, through the whole course of his private life, was completely exempt from all the errors and failings of human nature, *is a question* of no great intrinsic moment, and concerning which we have no sufficient data to lead to a satisfactory answer!" \*

Doctrines such as these are utterly incompatible with Trinitarianism, as we believe they are with the Scriptures. No hope of Christian union between these antagonistic beliefs can exist; they are subversive of each other;—one or the other is radically and fatally wrong. We have striven to present, as best we could, what we believe to be God's truth; if it is truth, may this advocacy of it, in some humble way, redound to his glory; if it be error, may it fall powerless. Earnestly *the truth* should be sought after; one or the other doctrine, we repeat, is fatally false; either the Trinitarian is guilty of idolatry, or the Unitarian of blasphemy.

---

\* Belsham, apud Dr. Gregory, *Letters on the Evidences*; let. 15.

## ART. VII.—YAHVEH CHRIST.

*Yahveh Christ; or, the Memorial Name.* By ALEXANDER MACWHORTER, Yale University. Gould & Lincoln. 1857.

THE great and leading object of the author of the above work appears to be, to show that JEHOVAH or YAHVEH, the Memorial Name of God as proclaimed in the Old Testament, was intended to represent the future Deliverer of our race, Christ the Savior, as announced in the New.

To this proposition he attaches very grave importance. Both Jews and Christians, he thinks, have failed to recognize the high significance of the name, and to preserve its due honors; the former by permitting it, in a manner, to fall into disuse, and covering it with superstition; and the latter in that they have not, with their superior advantages, drawn aside the veil, and re-asserted the Memorial Name with its true import and bearings.

His position is simply this: that fallen humanity having the promise of a future Deliverer in the "seed of the woman," the name *Jehovah*, as prophetic of *One who will be*, was applied to that Deliverer in the original Scriptures.

"Who is prepared to find," says he, "that this Memorial Name, instead of being the announcement of a God 'afar off,' is the announcement of Christ himself, the Deliverer of the Old, as he is the Redeemer of the New Testament? That the name *Jehovah* is a proclamation, a promise, and a prophecy of Christ, throughout all time?"

Our author, throughout, instead of plucking away any of the jewels which sparkle in the Savior's diadem, seems desirous to have him crowned with the glories of Supreme Divinity and Empire; and the work of redemption which he has achieved, is represented as among the most illustrious deeds of the Sovereign Ruler of the universe.

There are, however, at the same time, serious grounds of doubt, in some points at least, with respect to the justness of his criticisms, and the truth of conclusions thence dedu-

ced. The evidence does not appear so plain, as he seems to regard it, that when God is called "Jehovah" in the Old Testament, the name is given with special reference to his future appearing in our nature as our Deliverer.

We propose to examine the more prominent considerations, by which the author aims to establish this leading proposition.

Among these may be noticed, first of all, the future tense of the verb from which is derived the name Jehovah.

"Its true derivation," he informs us, "is from *havah*, the old root of the Hebrew verb *to be*. This old root form (*havah*), found its equivalent in *hayah*, the ordinary form of the Hebrew verb *to be*; and it is in the third person singular, future, of this latter verb *hayah*, (*to be*),—namely, in the form of its old future, *yahveh*, that we find the true place and pointing of the word rendered "Jehovah" by our translators. It is this form, *yahveh*, literally, (*he will be*), turned into the noun or name *Yahveh*,—*he who will be*,—which God adopts as his name and memorial to all generations."—pages 22—23; see, also, Ex. iii: 14—15.

But though such be the true etymology and grammatical sense of the original,\*—in connection with the purpose of God to become incarnate,—yet we see not, as hence arising, any necessity for the conclusion at which the author has arrived.

1. The future tense of the Hebrew verb, so far from being restricted to the idea of futurity, is very commonly used to denote the past. It is needless to give examples when the thing is constantly exemplified. And although much the greater number of examples be found in connection with *Vav Conversive*, as indicating a general historic sense, yet there is no *necessary* connection between the use of the *Vav* with the future and the idea of past time, for the future without the *Vav* connected with it, is sometimes employed to represent the past, especially in connection with the idea of customary or *continued* action.—(See Gen. ii: 5, 6, 10,

---

\*This, however, is by no means so universally admitted a point among Hebrew scholars as Mr. MacWhorter claims. Michaelis maintained that *Jehovah* is the true pronunciation; an opinion which *Gesenius* admits is not without apparent grounds, (Lex. sub. v. 2d-, paragr. extr.) and Dr. Conant speaks of such proposed changes in the pointing of the word, as "literary novelties," "mere conjectures, more or less probable."—(Job, ch. i.v. 6.)—[Eds.]



25; Josh. x: 12; 1 Kings v: 25; Job i: 5, &c.) Similar remarks will apply to the present time as expressed by the future. We therefore consider that the name under consideration not only announces *One who will be*, but with equal propriety *that Being who was and is*.

2. The future tense of the verb in question, with its latitude of meaning, is, after all, the most appropriate one to be employed, even without any reference to the great fact of the incarnation. Jehovah reveals himself as the Supreme God. In this capacity, and sustaining a near relation to his people, he must needs be self-existent and all-sufficient. And that such might be the case, his existence must have been from eternity. Also, that Existence which necessarily was and is, must, for the same reason, continue through all eternity. But contemplating the Deity as the all-sufficient Good, not eternity past, but eternity to come, is the period during which he can be fully made known and enjoyed. If, therefore, there could be a word found, giving, at the same time, great prominence to futurity, and embracing within its import the past and the present,—such is the word which, one might suppose, would be employed to represent a Being of such grandeur and goodness. Yet such, precisely, is the word under consideration.

3. Also, when, in the New Testament, the verb signifying *to be* is employed to represent the Son of God, either the present time is expressed, or past, present and future are all combined. Thus: “Before Abraham was, I AM,” saith the Messiah.—John viii: 58. “And he is before all things,” saith the apostle, “and by him all things consist.”—Col. i: 17. “Jesus Christ (who is) the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever.”—Heb. iii: 8. And saith Christ: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, (that is, Jehovah,) which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.”—Rev. i: 8. In these declarations the Son of God seems referred to, not in his incarnation, but in his divine nature and attributes. What he *was*, he *is*; and what he *is*, becomes the representative of what he *will be*. This Supreme Deity is exhibited in its priority to Abraham, in its immutability, as it was, and

is, and will be. From the considerations now submitted, we cannot perceive the force of the argument, that the name JEHOVAH, as derived from the future tense of the Hebrew verb *to be*, contains a promise of his future coming as our Deliverer.

Our author attaches great importance to *Jehovah* or *Yahveh*—*He who will be*—as the Memorial Name of God. He says:

"The Memorial Name, 'Jehovah,' enfolds the whole doctrine of God in his relation to man, comprehends the work of redemption, contains the law and the gospel, reaches back in its extended significance to the gates of Eden, and forward to the final coming of the Redeemer. It is this name, long buried, but now risen again in the light of modern investigation, to which we would restore the significance and glory of its ancient meaning." "When Moses entreated the Lord for a *name*, by which he might justify to the children of Israel his mission as deliverer, God answered: 'Go tell them, 'I am' hath sent you. This is my name forever, and this my memorial to all generations.'" We should naturally expect that a memorial name, given in such a crisis, (the distress of the Israelites in Egypt,) would express the relation in which God, the everlasting God, is brought nearest to his people; that it would represent those promises by which he was remembered with hope, through all the troubled times in which Zion was tossed with the tempest, and not comforted, save with the comfort of this *memorial*. Finally, that it would be the name, or would represent the relation, by which, in these last days, we should remember him." "What then has become of that ancient name revealed for all time? and why is it not our memorial?"—pages 12, 14, 18, 19.

The importance of the Memorial Name of God is readily conceded. The question, however, will naturally arise, first of all, whether "*Jehovah*" alone constitutes the Memorial Name? or whether, in this '*memorial*,' is not included "*Elohim*," God? For the language runs: "The Lord God"—*Jehovah Elohim*—"of your fathers, . . . hath sent me unto you: *this* is my NAME for ever, and *this* is my MEMORIAL unto all generations."—Ex. iii: 15. This compound name, it would seem, became the Divine memorial. "For thy Maker is thine husband;" as declared again: "JEHOVAH of hosts is his name;—the ELOHIM of the whole earth shall he be called."—Isa. liv: 5. There would also seem to be a natural fitness for the use of *Elohim* as a component part of the Divine Memorial. This name occurring in the first sentence of Divine Revelation, and throughout in connection with the creative acts of the Deity,—the works

of creation are every where made the ground of appeal to mankind in behalf of God, and in opposition to idolatry. And accordingly "this glorious and fearful name" of the Creator is given: "The Lord thy God—Jehovah thy Elohim."—Deut. xxviii: 58.

But JEHOVAH is also the Memorial Name of God. Then, however, the question arises: is this name used in reference to the *future* manifestation of the Son of God—he *who will be?* or, he *who is*, and *was*, and *will be*, the self-existent, all-sufficient One?

Our author says: "Let us substitute the phrase 'I am,' carrying with it the meaning of self-existence, for the term Lord, or Jehovah, wherever it occurs in the answering declaration, and see how much of meaning or of comfort it carries with it."—page 16. But let us, in turn, substitute the phrase, I WILL BE, carrying with it the meaning of future existence, "for the term Lord, or Jehovah, wherever it occurs in the answering declaration, and see how much of meaning or of comfort it carries with it." Certainly, at least, a *present* good, other things being equal, is preferable to a *future* one. And Jehovah, as the self-existent One, and the all-sufficient Good, administers the richest comfort to the Christian's heart.

But Mr. MacWhorter says: "Does not such a proclamation (Ex. vi: 2—8) seem *out of place* in the circumstances?"—page 17.

The proclamation, indeed, seems quite *in place*. The Egyptians oppress the Israelites; and while the former defiantly inquire, "Who is Jehovah?" and the faith of the latter is feeble, God announces a name which banishes all doubt: "I AM JEHOVAH." It contains much that is adapted to their present circumstances. The Egyptian idols, being creatures, possessed the name, without the nature or attributes of Deity. But Jehovah, the Self-Existent, being supremely great and good, was adequate to every emergency, and able to render his worshipers completely happy.

Our author further inquires:

"If the fact of the POWER of God to accomplish what he had promised, was the fact he wished to impress upon the Israelites, why was not the name of God Almighty sufficient?"—page 17.



For the reason, we might say, that the whole is better than a part, or the greater is preferable to the less. Now the name *El Shaddai*, in the original, signifies, as it is rendered, God Almighty, (Ex. vi: 3,) or, emphatically and literally, the Almighty One. Both, *El* <sup>אל</sup> and *Shaddai*, <sup>שדי</sup> are from verbs signifying *power*; and the two used in combination, to form an expressive name of Deity, may be well understood as representing the Divine omnipotence. But the Memorial Name should express something more than a God of absolute power. The Lord of the universe should be exhibited in just proportions, and altogether glorious; and this is accomplished by announcing the name Jehovah. As, therefore, the Sovereign Ruler had made himself known under the idea of omnipotence, in an age when power became the rule of right, it was fitting, as the ages advanced, to give greater prominence to the name Jehovah; that he who was all powerful in dominion, might be known as most excellent in all perfections, the Supreme Good, worthy alike of our fear and of our love.

But it is still inquired :

"Is there not, on the face of the narrative, an implication of a greater difference in the significance of these names, than appears in our translation?"—pages 17—18.

Doubtless there is. But this arises naturally from the fact that one of these names is translated, while the other is either transferred or rendered imperfectly. In the one case, instead of *El Shaddai*, we have the phrase "God Almighty;" in the other, for *Yahveh* or *Jehovah*, we either have the same transferred, or its feeble representative, *Lord*. And in either case, it must follow, that the full difference in the signification of the two names, as they occur in our version, would not appear. But let us accord to the name *Jehovah* the import we have given it, and the difference in significance between this name and *El Shaddai*, is equal to anything that is indicated on the face of the narrative.

Once more the interrogation is made :

"Is it not probable, also, that a name adopted under such circum-

stances, to be perpetuated as a *memorial* to all generations, would contain some fact revealed, or relation assumed by God, fitted to be remembered in the connection in which it was declared?"—page 18.

Such is probably the case. Let us, however, advert to the facts. First, the name "Jehovah Elohim," was frequently employed by the patriarchs before the time of Moses. See Gen. ix: 26; xxiv: 7—27; xxviii: 13.

It is further worthy of remark, that when this name is adopted as the Divine Memorial, it is in answer to the inquiry of Moses as to the name by which he should establish his mission to Israel: "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, (I AM THAT I AM,) I AM, even Jehovah Elohim of your fathers, hath sent me unto you."—Ex. iii: 13—15. The name Jehovah is here divinely sanctioned, but not introduced as a new name. But in answer to the inquiry: "What is his name?" the response is given virtually: "*the same that you have heard from your fathers, 'Jehovah Elohim;'*" and such will it continue to be through future ages." The answer intimates that God is the self-existent and supreme Good, and that a further development of his name may not be given.

It may be of importance to state further, that the name Jehovah is represented, both here and elsewhere, as involving the most sacred and important relations to his people. He is exhibited as their Creator, Preserver and Sovereign. He is their Father and their Friend. "Jehovah is our Judge; Jehovah is our Lawgiver; Jehovah is our King."—Isa. xxxiii: 22. And in all this representation, there seems no tendency towards any special development of the idea of futurity; but all is, as occasion or circumstance may render most fitting, past, present, or to come. The great idea is not that at some future period *he will be*, but that now *he is* their Lord God, their mighty Deliverer, ready and present to save.—Ps. xlv.

And if the question be reiterated: "What then has become of that ancient name revealed for all time? and why is it not our memorial?" We answer: that reverend name we hail, as it now appears with grace and grandeur on the face of the sacred page; it is enshrined in the hearts of the

faithful ; it adds sweetness and majesty to the hymns of the sanctuary ; it falls with impressive emphasis from the sacred desk, and angels and martyrs from the hill of Zion may hear an echo of the prophet's voice from the vale of tears : "Lo, this is our God ; we have waited for him, and he will save us ; this is JEHOVAH ; we have waited for him, we will be glad, and rejoice in his salvation."

Another argument by which Mr. MacWhorter endeavors to maintain his theory, is deduced from the manner in which the name Jehovah is used by Eve in application to her first-born : "I have gotten a man from the Lord."—Gen. iv : 1.

Here he contends, first, from the grammatical construction, that it is not to be understood as the name of God, but as the promise of the coming Deliverer of our race. He says :

"The preposition 'from' is not in the original. Literally it reads : 'I have gotten a man, even JEHOVAH.'"—page 24. Again : "It was natural that Eve should expect to witness, in her *life-time*, the realization of this prophecy," namely : that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. "Filled with this expectation, it was natural that, looking upon her first born, she should exclaim : 'I have received him, even Yahveh, even *he who will be.*'"—page 31.

We are inclined to admit, with the author, that the particle <sup>מִן</sup> (*eth*) should not be understood in the sense of "from" as in our version. But whether the sense of "with" should be rejected is not so clear. There are examples in which *eth* has the sense of <sup>בְּ</sup> (*im*), *with*.—Job xxxiv : 8, compared with Prov. xiii : 20.\*

Let us, however, consider more particularly the author's own position, according to the language which he puts into the mouth of Eve ; namely : "I have received him, even Yahveh, *even he who will be.*" He maintains here that *eth*, rendered "from" in our version, but which he translates *even*, is to be understood as a designating and emphatic particle ; (page 24 ;) that, as such, it is applied to Yahveh, and marks it as in apposition with "man," (*ish*), and con-

---

\* Gesenius renders this passage, Gen. iv : 26 : "I have gotten a man-child, *with Jehovah*, i. e. with his help, through his aid."—Jer. i : 8 ; xv : 20.



sequently, as the man himself is Yahveh, so Yahveh cannot be understood as the name of God, but merely as the representation of some future One, namely, Christ the Deliverer.

But this argument, though a most important one in the author's work, seems yet fallacious. He maintains that the particle under consideration is a designating and emphatic one; but also admits that the person, namely, Yahveh, to which it is here applied, is indefinite. He says:

"We have traced the history of Yahveh, and the unfolding promise of his great deliverance, from the first *vague and general* prophecy to Eve, to the more specific, yet still undefined promise to Abraham.—page 85.

We would here remark, that it is not clear that the particle in question is "designating" or "defining," as a general rule; although it is commonly used to denote that an object is already designated or defined. *An object already made definite, may take the emphatic particle  $\text{eth}$  before it, but generally not otherwise.* This important canon of criticism our author appears to have overlooked. Says Gesenius: "In the whole Old Testament, only three examples occur to us where ( $\text{eth}$ ) *eth* is used before nouns not made definite, namely, two where the sense itself is definite, Prov. xiii: 21; Ez. xliii: 10; and one where it is not, Ex. xxi: 28."

Now an object may be made definite in various ways, as follows. 1. By a proper name. Thus: "Seth lived an hundred and five years, and begat (*eth*) Enos;" but, without the proper name, the *eth* is dropped; "He begat sons and daughters," Gen. 5. The object is made definite, 2. By the article—Gen. i: 1, compared with chap. ii: 4. 3. By the adjective—Gen. i: 16. 4. By accompanying statements—Gen. i: 21—29. 5. By suffixes—Gen. xlii: 38. 6. By the genitive case—Esther ix: 14. 7. By plain and obvious reference—Gen. i: 17. There are, then, these different methods of specifying an object; and then the object so made definite may receive the emphatic particle *eth* before it; that is, when used simply with emphatic or demonstrative power, without involving the prepositional sense.

This rule, therefore, commends itself to us: The emphatic

prepositive *eth* is used with respect to an object already made definite; and to this rule there are not, probably, more than three or four exceptions in all the original Scriptures, and not a single one, to our knowledge, in the book of Genesis.

Now from this rule two conclusions must follow:

1. That our author's view, in reference to the application of "Yahveh" to Christ, in the passage before us, is not critically correct. Because the word applied to him, even as late as the time of Abraham, though then "more specific" than formerly, was yet still "undefined;" a mere prediction that some one would appear at a still future period, ("*He will come,*") and the sense of deliverance is derived from other sources. The term so used is not made definite in any sense;—no proper name being employed, no article nor adjective, no describing circumstance or event, no suffix nor genitive case, and no plain reference; nothing, indeed, by which we can acquire any definite idea of the person intended by the simple future tense of the verb (he) *will be*.

2. Another conclusion is, that the word *Yahveh*, or *Jehovah*, must be understood as the name of God, there being no other person to be understood, after that of the Messiah is rejected. This word, applied to the Deity, at once became definite. It was the name of Him who was also called *Elohim*, so well known in the history of the creation. This word, given as a proper name to that Being who is already made known by name, and by his works, as also by revelation and special intercourse,—becomes at once definite, though not so when employed as a prediction of some future one left undefined.

Mr. MacWhorter further urges his point from the historic record of the name *Yahveh* or *Jehovah*. He says:

"It is also, as we have already stated, not merely ungrammatical, but *unhistorical*, and counter to the face of the narrative," (that is, "to put *Yahveh* in the mouth of Eve as the name of God," page 26,) "for we read in verse 25th (26th) of this same chapter," (Gen. iv.) "that men did not begin to call upon the name of *Yahveh*, *Jehovah*,—literally, *invoke with the name Yahveh*,—until the birth of Enos, the grandson of Eve.—page 35. "Proceeding with the narrative, we have, in connection with the birth of Enos, the record to which we have already alluded;—'Then began men to call upon the name of *Yahveh*, or *Jehovah*;' literally:—Then was begun invocation with the name *Yahveh*.'"—page 55.

Our author thus aims to prove that as Yahveh was not known by Eve as the name of God, at the birth of Cain, so that name must have been used by her to represent the future Messiah. But slender indeed, to us, is the evidence on which this conclusion rests. If the expression, "to call upon the name of the Lord," had been used but once in the original Scriptures, we should have been under the necessity of considering each term apart, and then of determining the joint sense of the whole. But in this stereotyped expression, the sense is to be decided by general usage.

Now that the meaning of this phraseology is to be received according to the rendering, "To call upon the name of the Lord,"—that is, especially, *in prayer*,—seems evident from the following examples: Gen. xii: 8, compared with chap. xiii: 4. That in this case Abraham performed acts of devotion, is clear, both from the preparation made in the erection of an altar, and the circumstances of need and dependence under which he was placed. Also, Psalm cxvi: 4. "Then called I upon the name of Jehovah; O Jehovah, I beseech thee, deliver my soul." Here the passage itself explains the sense of the expression. So, also, Psalm xviii: 6, (7 of the Hebrew text,) "In my distress I *called upon* Jehovah, and *cried* unto my Elohim." The "name" is simply omitted, and the second member of the verse merely intensifies the idea first expressed. But the following example will supersede the addition of others—Joel ii: 32, compared with Acts ii: 21, and Rom. x: 13. There it will be seen upon examination, the Hebrew קָרָא (*qara*) is rendered by καλέω (*kaleo*), signifying not to *invoc*e, but, properly, to *call*; the preposition is represented by ἐν, of which the meaning is not *with* or *by*, but, plainly, *upon*; Κύριος—Lord—also occupies the place of Jehovah, and in the genitive case, as governed by the Greek word for "name," plainly indicating the relation which Jehovah sustains in the original expression. It might here be remarked, that the rendering of the expression in the Septuagint, is the same as is presented by the apostles, except when, to give intensity, the preposition ἐν is reduplicated, that is, prefixed to the verb, and also placed between the verb and the following noun,



—which, however, but seldom happens. The sense of the expression, therefore, “to call upon the name of Jehovah,” (Gen. iv: 26,) is not, as our author supposes, *to make invocation by that particular name*, as then for the first time, but, simply, *to call upon God*, especially in prayer.

But our author says of the expression, “to call upon the name of Jehovah:” “That this has reference merely to the worship of God, cannot be; for we know that Abel worshipped, and Seth was in the line of the faithful.”—page 55.

The premises of our author here may be readily admitted without adopting his conclusion. Abel had already fallen a victim to the wrath of his brother; and Seth might well be said to be “in the line of the faithful;” for it is here said that “to him also was born a son, and he called his name Enos: then men began to call upon the name of the Lord;” or, literally: “Then it was commenced to call upon the name of Jehovah.” The verb for “began” in the original, is impersonal, (having nothing, consequently, to correspond with “men” in the English version,) in the Hophal conjugation, denoting the passive sense of Hiphil, which is causative of Kal; though, however, it is sometimes used intransitively, as it is here rendered in English. With the intransitive sense, the verb would naturally be restricted to a single person, with the singular pronoun understood, which in the Septuagint is the case. We would prefer the passive impersonal; “Then it was begun, . . .” Acts of violence have been perpetrated from the days of Cain; but now it is different—the great work of a holy reformation is begun; and men call upon God in prayer. This invocation, therefore, at the birth of Enos, being not by a *new name*, but indicative of renewed devotion, the name Jehovah may have been well known to Eve.

There is, however, another matter coming under the head of historic records, to which our author seems to attach no small importance. We refer to the different fragmentary accounts of primitive times, distinguished by the terms “Elohistic” and “Yahvistic;” in the former of which the name Elohim simply is found, while in the latter that of Jehovah, also, frequently occurs. He says that—

"The history of the name Jehovah is the key to the interpretation of these documents. It not only explains the change from Elohim to Jehovah, but accounts with perfect consistency for the alterations in the documents themselves. A critical examination of the book of Genesis will show that Elohim, or God, was first in use as the *name* of God; Jehovah, or Yahveh, not appearing until the time of Enos, in connection with whose birth it is recorded,—“Then began men to call upon the name of Yahveh, or Jehovah, . . .” Jehovah Elohim, or Lord God, indeed appears in the second chapter of the narrative, but this will be seen to be the use of the name by the compiler or writer of the account,—Eve making use invariably of “Elohim” as the name of God, throughout her life-time. It is evident that both the writers and the compiler of these fragmentary accounts had an ‘internal historical sense,’ which would not allow them to put such an anachronism in the mouth of Eve, as the use by her of “Jehovah” would have been. This same use of Elohim, instead of Jehovah, holds true in respect to the only other character of the narrative introduced as speaking,—that is the Tempter or Serpent. After the birth of Enos a change is apparent, the name Jehovah appearing in the mouth of the next speaker, and continuing to be used throughout the rest of the Pentateuch as the name of God.”—pages 63—65, compared with page 60.

But the evidence from these documents, after all, is not conclusive. Indeed, on the contrary, a critical examination of the book of Genesis would conduct us to a different conclusion.

We may readily admit that there may have been such documents in existence at the time of Moses, and that these may have been before the historian when engaged in writing the sacred history: but he, as the only accredited historian of those times, was divinely superintended in the choice of such materials as were deemed, by the all-wise Intelligence, most fitting to be preserved. The declarations of the apostles will apply to him in their full force: “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.”—(2 Tim. iii: 16.) “. . . holy men of God spake (as they were) moved by the Holy Ghost.”—(2 Pet. i: 21.) The Spirit of God, then, being the Dictator, Moses was but the amanuensis; and so, “moved” by the Spirit of inspiration to write history for God, every word and every expression was as much guarded as if no such fragmentary accounts had ever existed. These things being premised, let us now advert to the facts in the case.

Mr. MacWhorter maintains that the name Jehovah was not in the mouths of any of the speakers until the time of Enos. His language unhappily leaves a false impression as

to the number of speakers, and their frequent use of the name Elohim. For example, he says: "This use by our first parents of Elohim, and not Yahveh, . . .," page 35, when only one of them, Eve, as recorded, used the name at all. Again: "We know, further, that Eve herself uniformly spoke of God as Elohim, and not Yahveh, as appears in her conversation with the Tempter, and in her reasons for naming Seth."—page 35. But the name occurred but once in that conversation, and but once in these reasons. And again: "Eve making use invariably of Elohim as the name of God, throughout her life-time."—page 64. And yet, at most, she used the name of God but three times in the history, twice only as Elohim, and once as Jehovah. Also, the terms "uniformly" and "invariably," being more appropriate when applied to considerable numbers, seem, at best, ill chosen when but two examples are found; and the more so, when the name Jehovah is actually used by herself once. And then the clause, too, "throughout her life-time," is hardly allowable; for, according to our author's own showing, the name Jehovah did come into use at the time of Seth, the grandson of Eve; at which time Eve herself was but one hundred and thirty-five years old,—an age of life at which, in those days, even the beauty of youth had scarcely faded.

But let us make a statement of facts in reference to the use of the names of God, from the beginning of the creation until the time of Seth, a period which, in the history, is included in the first four chapters of Genesis. The names of Deity, (*Elohim* and *Jehovah*) occur in all, during this period, both separately and apart, eighty-eight times; Elohim fifty-nine times, and Jehovah twenty-nine; in the following historic order: First, Elohim, thirty-four times in succession.—Gen. chaps. i. ii: 1—3. Next, Jehovah, used with Elohim twelve times.—Gen. ii: 4—21; iii: 1. Then Elohim occurs four times.—chap. iii: 1—5. Afterward, in the remaining portion of this chapter, the two names occur in combination eight times. And in chapter iv: Jehovah is used nine times, Elohim once.

Now the only question is with respect to the use of "*Je-*



*hovah*," by Eve, at the birth of her first-born. Our author thinks that as the Serpent and Eve made use of *Elohim* only, in the other cases, so, on occasion of the birth of Cain, she did not intend, by *Jehovah*, to express the name of God.

But the conclusion does not follow: 1. Because the four times that the name *Elohim* is employed in this conversation, so far as regards the effect to establish a rule, can really amount to but a single example. The name *Elohim* having first occurred, it would naturally continue to be used without change, while as yet the subject of discourse continued unchanged. This principle is applicable to the examples just given of the use of these names; first, to *Elohim*; then to *Jehovah Elohim*; and lastly, to *Jehovah* alone. 2. But we may possibly regard even this single example as a nullity. For there may have been a special reason for the introduction of "*Elohim*" in that conversation in preference to "*Jehovah*," and especially in preference to "*Jehovah Elohim*." *Elohim*, we know, was the ancient historic name of God in the work of creation, and this name might remind our primitive mother of the relations which she sustained to her Creator and Lawgiver. "Yet," saith the Serpent to Eve, "is it so that your Creator, and he who of right is your Legislator, hath given you any such orders with respect to that particular tree?" *Elohim*, then, would seem to be the proper name to be employed. And, moreover, the two names in combination might tend to exhibit the Divine character in such imposing grandeur as to defeat his own object. In terms sufficiently reverent, his aim was so to win upon the affections of Eve as to break her alliance to God. And in this affair, the name *Elohim* being once used, it was natural that she should employ the same.

But there are more direct considerations sufficient to justify the belief, that Eve, at the birth of her first-born, must have known God by his name *Jehovah*.

1. This conclusion follows from the fact, that Moses, in his account of the times which preceded the birth of Cain, makes frequent use of the name *Jehovah*. It occurs twenty times in connection with *Elohim*, as uttered by himself, pre-

vious to that event. Now a historian, in the history of a person who has borne different names in different periods, will naturally, at a given period, represent him by the name which he received during that period. This rule is faithful to nature. We present a single example, as given by the same historian,—the case of Abraham. The original name of this personage was *Abram*, which, when he was ninety and nine years of age, was changed to Abraham.—Gen. xvii: 5. And it is remarkable with what strictness the sacred historian observes the rule we have just stated. He is called by his proper name full fifty times before the change; but it is always *Abram*; afterwards it is uniformly *Abraham*.

Now, according to the canon just stated and exemplified, how can we account for the use of this name, Jehovah, in reference to a period during which it was not known that the Deity had such a name. It is not the incidental mention of that name that we refer to, but the frequent and general use of it twenty times in succession by the historian alone. Notice, also, this invariable use of Jehovah—joined with Elohim—in connection with the fact that, prior to this period, the name Elohim had been used thirty-four times in succession. But why was there, at this period, a change from the uniform use of one Divine name, to the uniform use of another Divine name? With these considerations before us, our conviction is, that Jehovah, as the name of God, must have been in use prior to the birth of Cain.

2. But there is another important matter, namely, that from this very time, and throughout the chapter, (Gen. iv.) the name Jehovah alone occurs. Eve herself first impressed the name on the face of history; but now, once developed, the historian of primitive man, divinely inspired, takes occasion, from that point of time, to make use of the name exclusively eight times in succession. Certainly, when Moses used the name thus, it was employed as the proper name of God. It would therefore seem to follow, from the canon of criticism already stated, that now especially the Deity was well known by his name Jehovah. And, after all, what could be more fitting than that Eve herself should be the first to use this name, as, emphatically and alone, the

name of God? She had, in unhallowed and mysterious intercourse with the Serpent, used and desecrated that sacred and ever memorable name, "Elohim," the name of her Creator. But now, turning away with grief and sadness, she says, on receiving her first-born, "I have gotten a man from JEHOVAH." But suppose she had used "Jehovah" simply as the representative of a future Deliverer,—why, then, should the historian, from that time, employ the same name, but in a different sense?

Also, in the light of the remarks now made, the appropriation of the name Jehovah to the Deity, for the first time, at or near the birth of Seth, would seem to put a singular anachronism in the mouth of Moses. For, according to this, the historian informs us that God was not before made known by this name, and yet he had himself uniformly used it from the birth of Cain.

Now the sum of the matter would seem to be this: First. The inspired historian proclaims the Deity by his name Elohim, as the primitive development of the Divine Being, during the period of his creative and formative operations. Then, during a period of intercourse with man, the same name is employed with "Jehovah" prefixed. The old historic name illustrated the greatness of God in his works; now is revealed another, to denote how essentially great he is in himself. And as the name Jehovah is thus fully introduced at a time when man was holy and innocent, it could not have been known as *he who will be*, the Deliverer, as unfallen humanity stood in no need of deliverance.

Next "Jehovah" appears alone on the page of history. And may there not have been a grave reason for the present use of this name instead of "Elohim," in view of the object to be accomplished at this time, namely, a revelation of the great doctrine of Incarnate Deity? To express this, "Jehovah" would seem more appropriate than "Elohim," as the doctrine itself contemplates God not as Creator, but in his *nature*, as connected with man. It is divinity and humanity united. With this high import, it was fitting that Eve, having her mind fixed upon the promised seed, should say, "I have gotten a man—Jehovah."



It simply remains now to solve a single difficulty, of which the solution, in the remarks just made, has been somewhat anticipated.

Our author has strongly urged that in the exclamation of Eve, at the birth of Cain, the word Jehovah is in the objective case, not as governed by *eth* (*with*), as a preposition, but by the verb; and that the particle is employed simply in the emphatic sense: "I have gotten a man, even Jehovah." And although, as before stated, there are examples in which *eth* has the sense of *with*, yet, as this particle is generally to be understood in the emphatic sense, we are, upon the whole, strongly disposed to adopt this sense in the present passage. But then the difficulty presents itself—how could Eve say, "I have gotten a man, even Jehovah," thus identifying essential Deity with man? Let this difficulty be removed, and the case is clear.

Now, on the supposition that our author's construction is correct, instead of supposing that the word Jehovah must lose its general import of Supreme Divinity, we have only to receive as inculcated the doctrine of the union of the two natures, Divine and human, in the incarnation of God. We know that it was the purpose of God, from the beginning, to become man; that by this means alone man could be redeemed; and that his salvation can be effected only by faith in the incarnate Son. Also, it is to be presumed, that after the fall, the Deity would reveal the great truth, that the nature of God will be united with that of man, and, if so, how naturally with the first-born, as the promised seed. Inspired, therefore, with the hope that God would enter into an intimate union with man, in the seed of the woman, how naturally might Eve, the mother of our race, exclaim, on the birth-day of her first-born: "I have gotten a man, even Jehovah;" God appears in human form to defeat our adversary and save us from ruin.

And the fact, that the most ancient Pagan nations have had, from time immemorial, traces of this doctrine, can only be accounted for satisfactorily on the supposition, that it was made known to the primitive ancestors of our race. Thus, the Hindoos teach the doctrine of ten principal Avatars or

Incarnations of Vishnu, their supreme God ; of which nine are past, and one is yet to come. Now the doctrine of the Incarnation of God is so much above the invention of man, that the only way of accounting for its existence among the heathen, is by tracing it up to a Divine Original. But it is evident that this faith of the Hindoos could not have been derived from either Jews or Christians, with whom they were not conversant ; but that, far back, in a common ancestry, when the whole family of man lived together, even before the confusion of tongues, and the consequent dispersion of the nations, they must have received this doctrine, and carried it with them when they left the primitive seats of our race. And it is clear that there is no passage in the inspired records that can so naturally lead the mind to this doctrine, as the words under consideration ; which were uttered by their primitive mother and ours : "I have gotten a man, even Jehovah."

But our author seems to complain both of Jews and Christians for adopting the speculations of heathen philosophers, as fixing the import of Jehovah, in preference to the simple statements of the inspired Oracles. He says :

"The ancient Hebrew Scriptures, falling into the hands of philosophers, rather than faithful students of history, bear the marks, to this day, of their speculations ; giving us not the historical Yahveh, or Jehovah, God of the Scriptures, but the philosophical "Theos," or God of Plato, and the school of Alexandria. This philosophical conception, beginning with the Septuagint, and endorsed by the Latin Vulgate, although departed from by Luther in his translation, has yet hitherto controlled the theology of the world."—page 95.

But Mr. MacWhorter would have done well had he paused and made the inquiry : whether, after all, not only Plato himself, but all the philosophers, did not actually borrow their *most* philosophical ideas from the Scriptures themselves ? Even the inscription of the Greek verb, *εἶ, (thou art,)* placed over the door of the temple of Apollo, at Delphos, they had doubtless borrowed from the Hebrew *הוּא (he is,)* whence, as we have seen, the name Jehovah. In their best and finest thoughts of God, it is not difficult to recognize a second, though greatly inferior edition of the original copy. But what we censure in them is, that when they have, as it

were, plucked flowers from the Rose of Sharon, they have seemed unwilling to acknowledge that they were not the native growth of their own soil.

Once more, our author says :

"This breadth of reference in the New Testament writers to Christ, as pervading the history of the Old, cannot be explained on the ordinary view. So, also, their references to passages in the Psalms and Prophets, as prophetic of Christ, appear often quite indiscriminate and incomprehensible, on the narrow methods of interpretation prevailing at the present day in the Christian Church, in respect to the Christ of Old Testament history."—pages 130—131.

And yet we can see no more difficulty in the one case than in the other, because, in both cases, we refer to essential Divinity ; in the one case, to that Divinity as *self-existent*, who yet designed to assume *humanity* ; in the other, to the same Divinity as *the coming One*, who yet is the self-existent Being. In both cases Christ is Divine as well as human, the Lord God, the Elohim of creation, and the Jehovah of the Hebrew Scriptures.

With great propriety, then, may we adopt the language of our author, according to his "breadth of reference," and say : "That Isaiah saw the glory of Christ, and spake of him ; in Isaiah it is the glory of (Yahveh) Jehovah. That Christ was the Leader of Israel in the wilderness ; in the narrative of their wanderings they were led by Jehovah. That Moses preferred the reproach of Christ to the treasures of Egypt ; in Exodus it is Jehovah for whom he endures all things. That at the giving of the law, the voice of Christ shook the earth ; in Exodus it is 'the voice of Jehovah.' That the spirit of Christ spake by the prophets ; the prophets themselves refer their utterances to 'the spirit of Jehovah.'"

Thus, too, according to the same method of interpretation, the references of the New Testament writers to passages in the Old, instead of being "indiscriminate and incomprehensible," appear plain, and easy to be understood. We have only to suppose that Christ is God, and the language of inspiration is clear and harmonious in every part.—Ps. xlv : 6 ; cii : 25, compared with Heb. i : 8—10.



According to our view, also, the proof of Christ's supreme Divinity becomes even more direct and conclusive. True, "Jehovah" is God, according to our author's view; but the evidence of this arises not from the import of the name, but from other considerations; and this name is merely adopted as a prediction that *he will come*; while the view that we present not only has all the proof of the other, but the additional one arising from the significance of the name itself. The view of our author is: That Jehovah—*he who will come*—(and presumed on other grounds to be God) is the Christ; whereas the old doctrine is: That he "whose name is Jehovah,"—the self-existent One,—is Christ the Savior. The incommunicable name Jehovah, therefore,—*this name*, losing none of its primitive grandeur, fitly expresses the supreme Divinity which the Savior claims.

To the remarks now submitted it may be superadded, that there are some passages in which the name Jehovah would not apply to Christ. Thus, in Mal. iii: 1, the first "messenger" refers to John the Baptist; the second "Messenger" to Christ. The first "Lord" is *Adon*; the second "Lord" is *Jehovah*. The *Adon*—Christ—who is "the Messenger of the Covenant," is "sent" by *Jehovah*. This name here retains its primary import of *self-existent Deity*, not in reference to the Son, but to the Father. The application thus becomes personal; just as we apply the name God, personally, to the Father or to the Son. And hence the author's attempt to confound the "Angel of Jehovah" with "Jehovah" himself, is to supersede all personal distinctions in the Godhead.—(pages 123, 132, 133.)

See, also, Ps. cx: 1, 2, 4, 5, compared with Matt. xxii: 44; Acts ii: 33—36; 1 Cor. xv: 25—27; Heb. i: 13. Here, one person, Jehovah, seated upon a throne, speaks to another, Adon, who is authorized to sit with him. And in the New Testament we learn that the former is the Father, and the latter the Son.

From such passages as these it must be obvious that the name "Jehovah," as also God, used without any necessary personal distinctions, may be, as it is, appropriated to the Father as well as to the Son.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

MISSIONARY TRAVELS AND RESEARCHES IN SOUTH AFRICA; including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loando on the West Coast; thence across the Continent, down the River Zambesi, to the Eastern Ocean. By DAVID LIVINGSTONE, LL.D., D.C.L. In One Volume, 8vo. With Maps by Arrowsmith, a Portrait on steel, and numerous Illustrations. (New-York: Harpers. 1857.)

Dr. Livingstone is a self-made man. A poor Scotch boy, his parents in so narrow circumstances as scarcely to be able to furnish bread and clothing for their household, he was put, at the age of ten years, into a cotton factory, to help to support the family by his slender earnings. But, like Hugh Miller, he thirsted for good learning. An evening school proffered him some advantages which he greedily embraced. Devouring every good book which came in his way, rejecting novels, which were not to his taste, he also mastered the rudiments of the Latin language, and at sixteen was able to read Virgil and Horace with facility. Scientific works, and books of travel, were his special delight. Nor was his religious training neglected. If his parents were poor, they were also pious; and now that the nation's homage is poured at his feet, it is delightful to witness the honest and sturdy resoluteness with which he persists in attributing all he is or has done to the faithful and rigid religious training of his early years. Under these influences, he became the subject of deep and decided religious impressions; and in the ardor of his first Christian love, devoted himself, in sacred purpose, to missionary labors among the heathen. His preference was to labor among the Chinese; where one mighty nation embraces about one-half of the unevangelized of our race. To fit himself for greater usefulness, he commenced the study of medicine, and while still working in the factory in summer, he was enabled to sustain himself during the winter in pursuing medical and Greek studies, and also hearing a course of lectures on divinity. These facilities, which Glasgow then afforded him, he prized and improved to the utmost.

Just at the time when he had fitted himself to be admitted as a licentiate of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons, the opium war was at its height, and frustrated his China plans. This turned his thoughts to Africa; and seventeen years ago he reached Cape Town, and soon found his way into the interior. From that time until last year, he has devoted the most strenuous endeavors to medical and missionary labors for the benefit of South Africa. We find him settled in Kuruman, some one hundred miles north of Orange River, as early as 1841. Two years later he pitched his tent in the beautiful valley of Mabotse, and there, and in the contiguous towns of Chanuane and Kolobeng, he passed the next half-dozen years in useful missionary labors. The simple rehearsal of some of his personal experiences, his imminent perils, his scientific observations, and his shrewd development of African character, as it gradually unfolded itself before him, all given with a natural freshness most winning and delightful, make even this early part of his journal more attractive and valuable than anything of the kind we have met with for a long time. Yet was all this experience only fitting him for the more important labors and acquisitions which have since given him such distinction.

In 1849 he reached Lake Ngami, under the twentieth degree of south latitude. Dr. Livingstone's wife and children were his traveling companions at the time he first reached the Lake; and one of the illustrations in this volume shows the entire company, Oswell, Murray and Livingstone, with the wife of the latter, babe in-arms, gazing on this fine sheet of water, in the interior of Africa. The Lake, however, has by no means the magnificent amplitude which has sometimes been attributed to it, being scarcely larger than Lake Winnebago in Wisconsin—say one hundred miles in circumference—not even approximating the size, grandeur and depth of our American inland seas. It is about two thousand feet above the level of the ocean, is perfectly fresh water, when the Lake is full, but becomes brackish as the process of evaporation reduces it in the dry season. Dr. Livingstone and his companions were the first Europeans who ever gazed upon its quiet waters. Soon after leaving the Lake, our travelers encountered the *tsetse*, whose bite is so fatal to oxen and horses,—while calves feeding on milk, the goat and sheep, and even human beings, are little incommoded by it. A principal object in their visit to this vicinity, was to make the acquaintance of Sebituane, an intelligent Makololo chief. He is thus described: "Sebituane was about forty-five years of age, of tall and wiry form, an olive and coffee-and-milk color, and slightly bald; in manner cool and collected, and more frank in his answers than any other chief I ever met. He was the greatest warrior ever heard of beyond the colony, and always led his men into battle himself. He had led a life of war, yet no one, apparently, desired peace more than he did. He had an idea that if he had a cannon he might live in peace." His great success in subduing and incorporating the tribes around him is here noticed, and the friendly reception he gave to our travelers. He evidently desired, as Sechele, one of his dependents, had done before,—that a mission should be established among his people; but his death, which occurred soon after their introduction to him, for a time prevented. His decided favour was, however, of great benefit ultimately to their object, his son and successor desiring to carry out his father's views. Our author remarks with evident feeling: "I was never so much grieved by the death of a black man before; and it was impossible not to follow him in thought into the world of which he had just heard before he was called away. He was decidedly the best specimen of a native chief I ever met." Here, as well as in North Africa, the unconquerable desire to obtain muskets was the first inducement to prosecute the slave trade. Yet our traveler declares: "I have never known in Africa, an instance of a parent selling his own offspring."

The effects of missionary labors among these rude tribes, Dr. Livingstone declares, at first rather disappointed him; but when he passed on to the true heathen, in countries beyond missionary influence, and compared the people there with the Christian natives, he came to the conclusion, that if the question were examined in the most rigidly severe or scientific way, the change effected by the missionary movement would be considered unquestionably great.

He found the rite of circumcision in some of the native tribes, where it could not, as in North Africa, be traced to a Mohammedan origin. He is express, however, in his testimony, that it is a civil rather than a religious rite. It is found, he thinks, among none of the negro tribes farther than twenty degrees south latitude.

The wonderful effects of prayer and singing, when first witnessed by the Bechuanas, is strikingly depicted. He was present on one occasion when a missionary attempted to sing among a wild heathen tribe that had no music in their souls; the effect on their risible faculties was such that the tears actually ran down their cheeks. The effects of the first preaching of the gospel have, in many instances, been so great, that even



these wild men immediately commenced secret prayer. The good influence of Livingstone's endeavor to preserve habitual cheerfulness, even when surrounded by the most depressing evidences of depravity, are briefly described by him, and may be copied with advantage by all in similar circumstances.

He at length determined to return with his family to the Cape Colony, and send them to England, while he, with the advantages resulting from all his experience and acquaintance with influential chiefs, set forth vigorously on the hitherto unattempted effort to make a thorough exploration of this vast *terra incognita*.

Accordingly he set forth from Cape Town in June, 1852, on the last and longest journey; and under circumstances full of embarrassment, he persevered for about two years, and reached Loando on the Atlantic Coast in June, 1854. What he endured, and the vast number of valuable discoveries he made while traveling, sometimes in a canoe, and oftener on the back of an ox, it is impossible for us even to hint at. We cannot follow him in this interesting journey, especially as aided by the large and minute maps, which enable you distinctly to trace all his course, without the liveliest sympathy with him in the pains and pleasures, the joys and sorrows of this marvellous career.

After four months' recruiting at the Portuguese settlement on the Atlantic Coast, the Dr. returned, making several important detours from his route in reaching it, and adding immeasurably to the amount of valuable information of all this region, its agricultural and other capabilities, and the facilities for opening a more extensive and profitable trade with its various inhabitants.

Not content with this achievement, however, after his return to the friendly tribe which had fitted him out to explore the western track, the same people generously aided his endeavour to make up the complement of his enterprize, by a journey to the east, so as to reach the Indian Ocean. He set forth with a noble retinue early in Nov. 1855. Descending the Zambesi river, their progress was easier and more rapid, and in six months and a half, including all their explorations and delays on either side, they reached Kilimane, very near the Ocean, May 20th, 1856. The hunting exploits were perhaps more perilous and exciting than ever, and the encouragements for trade, and for evangelizing the natives, were of the most cheering character. But the volume itself must be read to do any adequate justice to this subject. It will be found one of the most graphic, charming and useful publications for a long time issued. The publishers and artists have helped to do it ample justice, and its portrait, maps, and nearly fifty other illustrations of the most spirited kind, will give abundant satisfaction.

**AFRICAN EXPLORATIONS.** Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa. Being a Journal of an Expedition, undertaken under the auspices of H. B. M. Government, in the years 1849—1856. By HENRY BARTH, Ph. D.C.L., Fellow of the Royal Geographical and Asiatic Societies. Profusely and elegantly illustrated. In three vols., 8vo. (New-York: Harpers. 1857.)

After several months delay, we have from the American publishers the first two of these noble volumes, fully realizing the high promise and expectation which their announcement had awakened. They have been justly denominated "the most magnificent contribution of the present century to the cause of geographical knowledge."

A slight description of these volumes—such as the department of notices will allow—will verify these high claims.

In the Preface, the learned traveler states with refreshing and rare simplicity how he was introduced to this sphere of service. While leo-

turing at the University of Berlin on Comparative Geography, he learned that the British Government was about to send Mr. Richardson on a mission to Central Africa, and would allow a German traveler to join the mission, if he would contribute to his own personal traveling expenses. Soon as arrangements could be made for this purpose, Dr. Barth joined this mission, accompanied by another German, Dr. Overweg, "a clever and active young geologist." This was in October, 1849, and two months afterward these Germans had actually entered the field of their labors.

Dr. Barth had previously performed a journey through the Barbary States; and now beginning at the same point, they set forth from Tripoli, and with greater thoroughness than we have seen elsewhere, they describe the region lying next south of these Barbary States, and particularly the ruins, sculptures, and other remains of a very early and remote character, perhaps, identified with Roman, Carthaginian, and even a more primitive Berber origin. The first ten chapters are occupied with these interesting details, before they plunge into the desert, and approach tropical climes.

Then, as you spread out the map of Africa and trace their course,—not direct and rapid, but with many declinations to the right and left, and many delays at all places whose size, or other circumstances of interest, made them worthy of thorough examination,—and see this track which they have carefully marked, extending over twenty-four degrees from north to south, and twenty degrees from east to west in the broadest part of the country of Africa, reaching from Lake Tsad on the east, to Timbuctoo on the west, and extending south to Yola and Adamawa, some nine degrees only from the equator, the vastness of this exploration may be in outline conceived. To fill up the details with the exhaustive thoroughness of these patient German travelers, is worthy to occupy so full a space as is here devoted to this object.

Not a little additional interest is imparted to these journals from the fact that Dr. Barth has incorporated with his own travels the most reliable information which could be obtained of vast regions beyond his track on every side; so that, as the result of his careful sifting out the grains of truth from the chaff offered him, we have, from these volumes, a pretty full and faithful picture of about one-third of the vast African peninsula. In the incidental manner in which he brings out the natural features of the country, its rivers, plains, mountains, its soil and geological structure, together with the natural history of its teeming animal life, we get a more satisfactory idea of all these in their manifold relations, than any direct description could afford.

But chiefly are we interested in his full development of the human species, in their wide varieties, which here abound. The combined influence of climate, habits of life, government, religion and social connections, are here depicted: we have very little theorizing, but abundant facts as the materials and data of such scientific classifications, as have too often been attempted from conjecture, or wild and unreliable surmises. The conviction will be forced on every candid reader of these journals, that much which has hitherto passed for profound philosophy in regard to the inhabitants of Negroland, has been unfounded nonsense of bold, empirical pretenders. The work of classification must be begun again, founded more on facts, and less on hypothesis. What Africa has suffered from the Mohammedan despotism of her ruthless masters, and how deep and wide the inspissated fibres of the system of the false prophet have taken root, will here be conspicuously seen. Developments of the same character more recently made in British India, will coincide with these in carrying conviction to the most skeptical, that an authoritative limit must be enforced on the bad influence of Musslemen wherever Christian light and love are expected to be tolerated, and in the end to obtain the ascendancy.

Dr. Barth's relations to his fellow-travelers, Richardson and Overweg, seem to have been of the most satisfactory character, until one after the other, they both fell as martyrs to their noble efforts in the cause of scientific exploration and research. This left him alone for more than one-half of the whole period covered by this interesting mission. Our readers must not expect too much of a religious character in these volumes. Their author is probably a fair sample of the savans of Germany and her universities, but evinces no particular sympathy with more than the humanities of the Christian system.

Sometimes Dr. Barth traveled about almost alone; but the necessity of securing defence against the bands of robbers who infest many portions of the country, induced him, especially after the death of his associates, to connect himself with caravans and military expeditions, the purposes of which, in great part at least, were robbery, spoliation and enslavement, for the defeated party. He seems to have felt not a little the incongruity of traveling with such defenders, while under the commission and patronage of a government proposing, as one of its chief objects, the abolition of the slave trade. The necessity of the case appears to have reconciled him to it. In this way, moreover, we get a clearer view of the cruelty, wholesale murders, and other wretched results, among these people, of the slave trade, whether domestic or foreign. Sometimes the traveler remonstrated with his protectors, in reply to which the Vizier could only plead "the slave trade furnished them means to buy muskets." On which the following correct remarks occur in his journal: "Such is the history of civilization? If the poor natives of Africa had never become acquainted with muskets, the slave trade would never have reached those gigantic proportions which it has attained: for at first, the natives of Africa wanted fire-arms as the surest means of securing their independence of their neighbors; then these instruments of destruction became necessary, because they enabled them to make slaves of less favored tribes, thus obtaining those luxuries of European civilization, with which they had likewise become acquainted. Hence the debt which the European owes to the poor African, to right this mighty wrong."

The susceptibility of the Africans to suffering from a low temperature, Dr. Barth thus notices: "I have repeatedly had occasion to mention how sensitive the Africans are to cold; and I am persuaded, that in the burning regions of Central Africa a good cargo of under-clothing would find a ready sale, especially in the months of December and January."

His descriptions of some of the chief cities and towns visited, and their method of trade, the routes by which they can be best reached, the style of living, the productiveness of the soil, and many other matters of this kind, we have not space to advert to, except in this summary manner.

An examination of his route upon the map, shows how nearly his track, when farthest south, approached the regions of Central Africa, where the intrepid Bowen and his associates have not only explored, but actually have made permanent lodgment, planting there the banner of the Cross, that best extirpator of all evils. These journals of Dr. Barth's show how wide and inviting a field is now open for evangelizing labors in Northern and Central Africa.

**A HALF CENTURY OF THE UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY**, with particular reference to its Origin, its Course, and its prominent subjects among the Congregationalists of Massachusetts. With an Appendix. By GEORGE E. ELLIS. (Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1857. 8vo., pp. 511.)

This is one of the most significant books of the day. We regret that our space will not allow us to notice it as it deserves. Professedly historical, not controversial, and wearing the garb of great candor and courtesy, its author has an excellent opportunity to say much indirectly, yet most



effectively, in favor of Unitarianism and against Orthodoxy. His design is to state the fundamental doctrines of Unitarianism, and to show, by the history of the past half century, how far Orthodoxy has been compelled to modify its positions, and to approach Unitarian ground. Those who have hoped that Unitarians were fast forsaking their hostile attitude, and were almost ready to fraternize with the great body of Protestants, have only to read this book to be undeceived. On the unqualified denial of the three great doctrines,—the inheritance of a corrupt and guilty nature from Adam, the supreme deity of Christ, and the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus, to satisfy the claims of a broken law,—he declares that "Unitarianism has resolutely held its ground, and intends to hold it, firmly, and without yielding a hair's breadth." In defence of this position, he draws forth again the old weapons of the Unitarian champions, and some new ones of his own, and also endeavors to prove, not without a show of truth, that the tendencies of the recent speculations of many gifted minds nominally Orthodox, especially "in the American Congregational, and English Episcopal Churches," are in favor of what he calls "Liberal Christianity."

In the execution of his task he exhibits much skill and power as a writer. We doubt not he meant to avoid bitterness and "offensive language," but when we find him frequently applying to Calvinism such epithets as "harsh, ungenial, narrow," "unreasonable," "illiberal," "fanatical," "superstitious," "repulsive and forbidding;" when we read such shocking caricatures of Orthodox Christians and meetings as we find on pp. 339—40: and when we see him arrogantly boasting that "a fair and just combination of the elements of intelligence and piety, an harmonious adjustment of the relations of reason and faith, will issue in Liberal Christianity,"—we cannot admit that he has succeeded.

A remarkable feature about all his arguments is, that he relies very little upon *quotations* from the only true source of theological light, the Bible; preferring to take refuge in *general* assertions or denials, such as: "No oracle, vision, chronicle, proverb or psalm, recognizes the doctrine" [of our connection with Adam's sin and fall]. "One passage in the New Testament furnishes all the substantial authority which the Gospel is supposed to give to this doctrine. Not a word, however, can be quoted from the Savior's lips in recognition, still less as an assertion of the doctrine." "He [Christ] forbids all homage or supplication addressed to himself, and enjoins that such exercises be offered to God"!! Indeed, the obvious duty of "following the argument for the deity of Christ into those ambushes of sentences, half-sentences, and phrases called texts—proof-texts—in which it is supposed to hide," he stigmatizes as "very unwelcome work," and accordingly soon abandons it.

Nor, although it must be admitted that he has some ground for the very serious charge, that several distinguished men, both in our own country and in England,—whom he eulogizes in the most glowing terms,—are "engaged in invalidating the doctrinal views" they nominally profess,—is there a shadow of truth in the assertion that such men are "approved Orthodox writers." If the leading Orthodox journals are to be regarded as exponents of public sentiment, these heretical innovators are already branded with the stigma of disapproval, and the very compliments which this work so profusely strews at their feet, will but awaken still stronger suspicion and dislike of their dangerous errors.

This we regard as the chief value of the book. It will draw a line of discrimination between the real friends of Orthodoxy, and the traitors in the camp. It strips off the "testudo" under which the sappers and miners at the foundation of the Christian faith have been secretly working, and reveals clearly the insidious and fatal tendency of their labors. It may, perchance, hasten some of them to retrace their steps, and others to throw themselves *openly* into the Unitarian ranks.

Another good result from the work is, that here Unitarianism is exhibited in its true colors and tendencies, and the picture is by no means a flattering one. The author acknowledges as among the proximate causes of its origin in New-England, the prevalence of the "half-way covenant," and of the dogma that "a profession of piety ought not to be required of those who should offer themselves for communion," as "among the appointed means of regeneration." "By that innovation, not only did church members come into communion, but ministers also acceded to pulpits without *reaching in spiritual stature the high mark of Calvinism.*"—p. 23. Springing from such a source, it is no wonder that it was at first, and ever since has been strongly *destructive* and *negative* in its character, full of objections, and mighty to *pull down* the established doctrines of Christendom, but weak and unstable in building up a positive faith. In our author's definition of the three distinctive points of his creed are no less than *twelve negatives*, and the same peculiarity runs through the book. He can deny with great boldness, and demolish with hearty good-will the Calvinistic doctrines, but when he is called upon to state the Unitarian position, he has "to admit vagueness and indefiniteness into the creed." "There *must be some other* explanation of our frailty and sinfulness than" the Calvinistic one, but our author will not undertake to give it. Jesus Christ is not God—that is certain; but he may hold any other rank, from that of "pure humanity," up to "a sacred companionship in the otherwise lonely majesty of heaven, the sharer, and *almost the equal in essence with the Supreme*!" The "legal, governmental theory of the Atonement" is utterly without foundation in Scripture or reason, but exactly how "Christ died for our sins," or what precise benefits he has bestowed upon us, we cannot learn from these pages.

We are told that the Scriptures "manifest errors and perplexities, inconsistencies and discrepancies, found in a close and careful study of the record, which utterly confound one who seeks to refer them all to inspiration from God," and yet that "there is an inspiration of the Scriptures;" though the Unitarians "have never given a rigid dogmatical definition of their idea or their belief on this point." We hardly think such a definition necessary, after those holy writings are arraigned as abounding in mistakes, and after such a declaration is made as that "science, history, chronology, geography, and even morality and piety can propose valid objections to more or less important contents of the Bible, if the *letter* is insisted upon, and a plenary inspiration claimed for it."—p. 241. It is impossible for us to reconcile the compliments which Mr. Ellis pays the Bible as "the world's only light, law and hope," "an island rock" amid "the sea of human life," with his previous assaults upon the veracity, the wisdom, and the inspiration of its writers.

Well may he describe Unitarianism as "loose, vague, general, indeterminate in its elements and its formularies;" and as a legitimate consequence has it "proved itself inferior to Orthodoxy as a working power, a method of presenting and applying the gospel so as to engage the enthusiasm, the zeal, the hearty, devoted service of its disciples in devising eminently Christian schemes, and in carrying on great religious enterprises." It is to us astonishing that Mr. Ellis should complain of the exclusion of Unitarians from Christian fellowship with other denominations, for we are satisfied that no Orthodox man or woman can carefully read his work without being more than ever filled with "horror of the calm, cold, languid spirit of Unitarianism, of its bleak and houseless exposure, and of the precipices of infidelity which it leaves unfenced."—p. 370.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, OBJECTIVELY CONSIDERED. Being the first part of Theology considered as a Science of Positive Truth, both Induc-

tive and Deductive. By ROBERT J. BRECKENRIDGE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary of Danville, Ky. (N. Y.: R. Carter & Brothers. Louisville, A. Davidson. 1858. 8vo. pp. 530.)

We might call this work "the Calvin's Institutes of the Nineteenth Century." The author proposes to treat Theology, the "noblest of all the sciences," under three aspects. 1. The Knowledge of God, *Objectively* Considered. 2. Considered *Subjectively*. 3. Considered *Relatively*. Leaving the latter two portions for subsequent discussion, this treatise professes "to present in a perfectly distinct and connected manner, and to demonstrate as positively certain, the sum and system of Divine knowledge, simply as knowledge, unto salvation." The order in which the author's system is developed is new and striking. He commences with "Man," his ruined moral condition, and immortality; thence proceeds to the Divine interposition to save him; treats of the "Mediator" in all his offices, of "God" in his existence and attributes, (to which, also, he has given a new classification;) then discusses the nature and sources of the knowledge of God, and closes with the sum and result of all.

His doctrinal views are thoroughly Calvinistic, and although generally bold and fearless in announcing his conclusions, there are frequent evidences that he has paid due deference to the "Standards of the Westminster Assembly," and to his "official position as a teacher of theology" in the Old School Presbyterian Church. There is, however, no dodging or evasion of the great questions which have been the themes for "the conflict of ages." The author has evidently passed through the intense mental and spiritual struggles he so well describes, in view of those infinite problems "over which the heart agonizes, and before which the intellect recoils," and has here given the solution of them to which the Bible and reason have conducted *him*. If it does not seem to all his readers—as he repeatedly claims—"established," "demonstrated," with "infallible certainty," "a perfectly exhaustive solution," yet to it must be granted the merit of simplicity and logical consistency; and whether all his positions be admitted or not, the earnest study of his book cannot fail to invigorate the mind, and to benefit the heart. Few theological works have appeared from American authors combining so much compact argument and thorough scholarship, with so much eloquence and *practical* power. As might have been expected from the author, he cannot let Romanism and High-Churchism pass without an occasional deadly blow. As a Pedobaptist, too, he has one or two brief paragraphs on the church-membership of infants, (p. 186,) though his doctrine of "the *total separation* of the Messianic kingdom, in its new state, from this world and the kingdoms thereof," (p. 395,) as well as his doctrine of hereditary depravity, seem to us totally inconsistent with any recognition of the unregenerate as members of Christ's Church.

OUR LORD'S GREAT PROPHECY: and its Parallels throughout the Bible, Harmonized and Expounded: comprising a Review of the common Figurative Theories of Interpretation. With a particular examination of the principal passages relating to the Second Coming of Christ, the End of the World, the New Creation, the Millennium, the Resurrection, the Judgment, the Conversion and Restoration of the Jews: and a Synopsis of Josephus' History of the Jewish War. By Rev. D. D. BUCK, author of "The Christian Virtues as a Divine Family," etc. (New-York and Auburn: Miller, Orton & Mulligan. pp. 472.)

The author of this work is a believer in the "premillennial advent" of Christ. He makes rather bold claims to "originality," and indulges in too self confident and offensive attacks on preceding commentators who differ from him (pp. 68, 320, 381). Diffidence under such circumstances seems to us far more becoming and attractive. His style, too, is diffuse,



frequently inelegant, and disfigured by such newly coined or obsolete words as "happify," "mentality," "figuratist," "metaphorizer," "conceptually," &c. There is, however, a vigor in the thoughts, a clearness in the statement and arrangement of facts, and in the grouping of Scripture testimony to sustain his positions, and withal so much light shed upon the important prophecy discussed, that the book deserves and will repay attentive study.

It is an "exposition and harmony" of Matt. xxiv. and the parallel passages in Mark xiii. Luke xxi. and in Luke xvii. some of the verses of which, the author maintains, have been *transposed* from their proper order. He professes to point out exactly what portions of the prophecy relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, and what to Christ's coming at the end of the present dispensation. His main positions are that the prediction of Jerusalem's destruction closes with the 26th verse of Matthew, that Luke xxi: 24 should be inserted between verses 28 and 29 of Matthew: that consequently the "tribulation" of the Jewish people there described, instead of ending with the destruction of the city, will endure "until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled," and that "immediately after" that tribulation, the signs (v. 29) preceding Christ's advent will appear, then Christ himself, in power and glory. The prophecy in Matt. from verses 27 to 31 inclusive, he regards not as figurative, but literal, and as yet to be fulfilled.

The principal objection to this interpretation, namely, that in Matt. xxiv: 34 Christ says, "this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled," he answers by claiming that γενεά properly means *race, nation*, and that the passage means "the Jewish nation shall exist as a distinct people" till all be fulfilled. We doubt the soundness of this reply. That γενεα ατη means "this present generation" is at once the most natural interpretation, and in strict accordance with the Scriptural usage of the word.—vide Acts. xiii: 36, ii: 40; Matt. i: 17, xii: 41; Luke xi: 31; Heb. iii: 10. Had our Lord designed to say what Mr. Buck maintains, would he not have used the word γενος? See examples of its use in Mark vii: 26; Acts xiii: 36; Gal. i: 14; Phil. iii: 5. Is it not better to suppose that παντα ταυτα (all these things), in verses 32 and 33 refer to the signs preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, and that destruction itself, (mentioned in vs. 6—15 et seq.) and that ημερας εκείνης (that day) in verse 36, was used of Christ's advent, emphatically to distinguish the two periods from each other?

THE EPISTLE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL TO THE ROMANS; with Notes, chiefly explanatory. Designed as an accompaniment to the author's Notes on the Gospels and the Acts. By HENRY J. RIPLEY, Newton Theological Institution. (Boston: Gould & Lincoln, &c, &c. 1857.)

These Notes, though adapted to the English version, are in reality based upon the original text. In accordance with what seems to us a wise plan, they present the results of the author's investigations, without any parade of the process by which he reached those results; moreover, they are purely positive in their character, not offering explanations for the sake of showing their futility and the author's ability; finally, they are brief and to the point, leaving moralizing, poetical quotations, etc., to the essayist and preacher, and simply explaining the text. The understanding of the Epistle is much aided by the frequent use of analyses. First the Epistle is analytically divided. Then each chapter has a mention of its contents; and so with minor paragraphs. The text is printed in paragraph form, the chapters and verses, however, being indicated in the margin; the obvious advantage of which plan makes us desire its universal adoption, and wonder that it has not come to pass already. The views of the author seem to us, as far as we have examined, eminently correct;

while the clearness of his explanations will be approved even by those who may differ with him in sentiment. We have examined with care the notes on some of the more difficult passages, as : i : 4 ; iii : 5—8 ; v : 12—21 ; vii : 13—25 ; and deem them unusually satisfactory in matter as well as in manner. His views on v : 12—21 are, if we mistake not, similar to those so ably advocated by Stuart, which, admitting the peculiar connection between Adam and his posterity, yet avoid the extreme opinions of Haldane and others of his hue. We are pleased to see that concerning the famous conflict, recorded in vii : 13—25, touching which, among commentators, there has been so much conflict, he makes it peculiar neither to the regenerate nor to the unregenerate, but to humanity—to humanity just so far as unsanctified.

The Epistle to the Romans is at once so important, and so difficult of comprehension, and a brief commentary has been so long a desideratum, that we cannot but suppose that this little volume (147 pages octavo) will meet with a general and hearty welcome. We shall be glad if our word may promote this result.

**BIBLICAL COMMENTARY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.** By Dr. HERMANN OLE-HAUSEN, Professor, etc. Translated for Clark's Theological Library. First American Edition. Revised after the latest German Edition by A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., Professor of Greek in the University of Rochester, &c., &c. Vol. 4. (New-York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 115 Nassau Street. 1857.)

We hope at the completion of this valuable work, to furnish, from a competent source, a thorough critical review of the original commentary, and of this its translated and revised form. Meanwhile, we hail each new volume with pleasure, and earnestly recommend the securing of the work as issued. The present volume comprises the Epistles in order from Romans vii : 7, to Galatians vi : 18, and has the peculiar claim of constituting the first correct English edition of this part of the commentary; the Edinburgh edition, on which this is based, being deformed by the most serious errors. The editor states that the references in this volume to Winer's New Testament Grammar, are adjusted to the section and paragraph, (instead of page,) so that they will be equally available in the original or in a translation of that work. Such a translation, Sheldon & Blakeman propose shortly to publish.

**THE SAINT AND HIS SAVIOR; or, the Progress of the Soul in the Knowledge of Jesus.** By the Rev. C. H. SPURGEON. (New-York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1857.)

We have read this work less for criticism than for personal profit; and shall give our views of its merit, satisfied that many of our readers have already read it, and formed a favorable opinion for themselves. We had not expected the book to be one which it would be either pleasant or specially useful to read. We had thought to ourselves, Mr. Spurgeon is doing a great work as a preacher, and his printed sermons, taken as they fall glowing from his lips, are being read by thousands who will never see nor hear him; and he would do better to be satisfied with all this, and not be ambitious of authorship, in which department he will be tried by a severer rule, and in which he cannot hope for success equal to that which as a preacher he has enjoyed. We frankly avow ourselves agreeably disappointed, and now more than ever are we profoundly impressed with the fact that Mr. Spurgeon is a truly wonderful man. Coming to a London pulpit, a mere youth, with almost no previous experience, and necessarily limited stores, he has not only attracted thronged audiences from the beginning, and found through his printed sermons an audience almost as large as Christendom itself, but he has, at odd intervals during

the past three years, written a work of some four hundred and fifty octavo pages, made up of material entirely distinct from that of his sermons—a work which confirms the impression made by his printed sermons, that he has elements of power besides a commanding elocution. All too seems done with so much ease; and with the boldness of a man who is conscious of what he can do, he anticipates serving God and his generation in future, not only as a preacher, but as an author. And we see not but that he bids fair to become in the latter capacity a compeer of Baxter and Doddridge, as in the former he has already become of Wesley and Whitefield. We have asked ourselves the secret of his prodigious labors. He is, without doubt, possessed of rare endowments—a fertile mind, vigor of body, buoyant spirits. He must be a systematically industrious man; and, above all, he must be, in a peculiar manner, divinely directed and sustained. We think that his personal piety, as much as any other quality, is attested by all his labors.

The first trait that strikes one in this, as in all of his works, is the perfect naturalness of every thing. The things which he says, and the way in which he says them, seem just what and how we would have spoken. Take a simple illustration. In his preface, referring to the laboriousness of composition, he says: "Well may a man's books be called his 'works,' for if every mind were constituted as mine, it would be *work* indeed to produce a quarto volume." This remark has seemed to attract the notice of every one who has seen or heard it as so natural. Sure we are, that whoever has known the painfulness of composition, must feel as though it were his own, so well does it express the idea he has often had. And so it is with Mr. Spurgeon's treatment of any subject;—when presented, one is impressed that that is just the right way, that no other could answer so well. Than this there is perhaps no better test of genius;—the saying what, in manner and matter, seems to every one, when said, just the thing which himself would have said.

All of Spurgeon's works evidence his undoubted, intense conviction of the truth and reality of the doctrines which he presents. Hence, even in this work, his first specially addressed to readers rather than hearers, he deals comparatively little in argument to the mere intellect. He seems to recognize the facts that the statements of the Bible ought to be, as with most minds they are, ultimate, and that men need not so much logic to convince them, as they do the simple hurling of the truth itself upon their hearts and consciences, and that consequently much purely *a priori* argument were alike useless and impertinent. Some minds more than others, we know, naturally tend to this kind of argument; yet we cannot but believe that any large amount of it, habitually and formally used in sermons, not only renders preaching largely ineffective, and begets a habit of doubting in hearers, who can often see that the minister proposes to prove something, without fully appreciating his proof, but also indicates but too surely the want of thorough satisfaction on the part of the minister himself. Not that we object to reasoning with men. All discourse is truly, permanently effective, in proportion, *ceteris paribus*, as it has a solid backbone of argument; and many sermons, perhaps the majority, elaborate in composition, and eloquently delivered, lack in just this thing. The whole system of religion is based upon the most substantial reasons, and the Bible constantly plies man with these reasons, addressed both to his rational self-love, and to his conscience. All that we object to is the constant going behind and beyond the Bible, as if the battle for the evidences of its verity were to be fought in every sermon. Now Mr. Spurgeon's works, and especially that before us, are very far from being wanting in argument such as we think useful, and alone useful, in such works. Indeed, even when not directly arguing, most powerful arguments lie half concealed in his illustrations. Thus, when he



would show the folly of him who, though convinced of the fulness of the gospel, yet "turns away from its glories under the sad supposition that they are intended for all men save himself," Mr. S. says: "The air, the stream, the fruits, the joys and luxuries of life, he takes freely, nor ever asks whether these were not intended for a special people; but at the upper springs he stands fearing to dip his pitcher, lest the flowing flood should refuse to enter it because the vessel was too earthy, to be fit to contain such pure and precious water."

This work well illustrates the difference between amplification and mere repetition; the former of which is often so needful and desirable, the latter always worse than useless. Mr. Spurgeon understands how to place an important thought in many different lights; so that it may be seen by minds of different constitution and circumstances, and by all more clearly, and yet having in each light so much of novelty as to forbid weariness. And in doing this he is affluent in illustration, which, as we have already suggested, often convinces, while it reveals. For this illustration he lays all things under tribute, and gathers it with apparent ease from every source. He has all that rich variety which characterizes some of the old divines, without that stiffness and appearance of effort which their writings show. We confess in the reading of this book to have felt about him, much as did the wondering villagers, in Goldsmith's *Deserted Village*, at the village schoolmaster. We had purposed to verify our remarks by some quotations; but this it were difficult to do, satisfactorily, in our brief limits, so many are the gems which sparkle on every page. It were easier to compile quite a paper of the "*Beauties of*" *Spurgeon*. The book itself, by the way, abounds in quotations; many of them being from the classics, and from the old divines, and so apropos as to indicate, on the part of the author, familiarity with those writings. Hymns, too, adorn his pages; a species of composition ridiculed by Dr. Johnson, yet which, in one of its illustrious specimens, was wont to move even his rugged nature to tears; and a species which is never amiss in a sermon, or in any work of devotional cast.

We mention one more peculiarity in the work before us: the close discrimination of character, and the corresponding adaptation of truth to different classes. There is no mere throwing out of truth in unbroken masses, to be appropriated, in kind and degree, as each hearer or reader pleases; but there is a careful breaking of it up into fragments, and a distribution of them according to their respective fitness for different characters. There is, what the apostle enjoins, but what is too much neglected, a "*dividing* the word of truth, giving to each a portion in due season." In this respect, we think Spurgeon not unlike, certainly not inferior to William Jay. More or less of the pulpit style prevails throughout. Sometimes there is an appearance of extravagance, which is relieved, however, by the directness of address which constantly makes one feel as if he were listening rather than reading.

It were superfluous to say that this work is thoroughly evangelical. Its theme is indeed Jesus, whom it exalts as the altogether lovely, the only, the all-sufficient Savior. It contemplates the soul in all its relations to that Savior, both before, during, and after conversion. Though designed, as the author says, with a modesty which agreeably surprised us, only for the young and inexperienced Christian, we cannot but think that it has that richness of truth, and is pervaded by that spiritual unction, which will make it pleasing and profitable reading for all who love the Lord Jesus; while those brief addresses to the impenitent reader, following every chapter, serve to point its truths of joy and comfort into arrows of conviction for his soul.

We have little to criticise, and are happy to have been able, consistently with faithfulness, to exercise the more pleasant office of a reviewer, and

point out excellences rather than faults and defects. We notice from the use of the author's "we," an occasional ambiguity when he would speak of his personal feelings and experience. His passing criticism on Ps. iv: 6, we regard incorrect. He makes the italicised word "*any*" the emphatic one. Instead of which, the true idea is gained by its omission. The cry is not for "*any good*"—as if none were enjoyed, and "*any*" would do; but for "*good*," i. e. absolute good, that which would "*satisfy*" the soul, and which had not been secured by the attainment of much that was good as far as it went. The book, though otherwise well executed, contains sundry minor typographical errors, which will doubtless be corrected in subsequent editions.

**CHRISTIAN CONSOLATIONS.** Sermons designed to furnish Strength and Comfort to the Afflicted. By A. P. PEABODY, Pastor of the South Church, Portsmouth, N. H. Third Edition. (Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1857. 16mo., pp. 438.)

This volume contains thirty-three sermons, five of which were not included in former editions. In many respects they are admirably suited to comfort the afflicted child of God. His character as our heavenly Father, the paternal love evinced in the afflictions he sends, the wisdom and goodness of his providence, the unspeakable joys of heaven, the fraternal sympathy of Jesus, "our Divine fellow-sufferer," and many other topics of consolation, are dwelt upon with much tenderness of emotion, vividness of illustration, and classic beauty of style. These Sermons may be read with profit and pleasure by the most orthodox believer in the divinity of Jesus. The fact that the writer is a Unitarian clergyman is apparent only by the omission of those frequent references to the cross of Christ, and his atoning sacrifice for sin, which so abound in the Scriptures, and in the sermons of Trinitarians. His view of Divine Providence is such as to satisfy the most rigid Calvinist, and his exalted ascriptions of praise to "the Divine Founder of our religion," of "reverence, love and gratitude," of "the warmest devotion" to the great Mediator, seem to us hardly compatible with any doctrine which makes him less than God.

**EXPOSITIONS ON THE CREED, THE LORD'S PRAYER, AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.** By ROBERT LEIGHTON, D.D., Archbishop of Glasgow, with an INTRODUCTORY ESSAY, by JOHN PYE SMITH, D.D. (New York: Carter & Brothers, Broadway. 1858.)

The subjects treated of in this work, the character of its author, the Introduction by Pye Smith, and the imprint of its publishers, all attest its general excellence, and make a reviewer's praise well nigh superfluous; we may, however, express our pleasure at its issue in a form so well adapted to general circulation.

**AN EXPOSITION OF THE ASSEMBLY'S CATECHISM,** with Practical Inferences from each Question, as exhibited in Dartmouth, 1688. By Rev. JOHN FLAVEL. (New-York: R. Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1858.)

Of course, the usual heresies, as we deem them, on the act and subjects of baptism, and one or two kindred points, are defended in this, as in every work based upon the Assembly's Catechism. With this exception, we regard the Catechism itself, and the present Exposition of it, as valuable compends of religious truth. The spirit of this work is eminently fervent, it being the last labor of its godly author. The catechetical mode of instruction, while liable to great and obvious abuse, has also undeniable advantages. This is the plan of the author, who explains each question of the Catechism by several other subordinate questions, and introduces the "practical inferences" also in the same way, so that the book is, in fact, a Catechism upon a Catechism. Both Exposition and Inferences are abundantly backed, if not always sustained, by proof.

texts. We think the general usefulness of the book would have been enhanced by an index of topics, and we wonder that this did not occur to the publishers. As it is, to refer to a particular topic, unless one has a copy of the Assembly's Catechism, he must find that topic by turning over the pages.

SERMONS OF THE REV. C. H. SPURGEON, of London. Third Series. (N. Y., Sheldon, Blakeman & Co.; Boston: Gould & Lincoln; Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1857. 12mo., pp. 448.)

These twenty-nine sermons need no recommendation of ours. Whatever critics may think of their style, *the people* have stamped them with the seal of their approval, and the Holy Spirit has blessed them to the conversion of souls. As specimens of the best method of presenting sacred truth to the popular mind, they are unrivalled, and the success of their author is destined to create a revolution in the art of sermonizing. Let him describe them in his own words:

"We must preach as Christ did; we must tell anecdotes and stories and parables as he did; we must come down and make the gospel attractive. The reason why the old Puritan preachers could get congregations was this—they did not give their hearers dry theology; they illustrated it; they had an anecdote from this and a quaint passage from that classic author; here a verse of poetry, here and there even a quip or pun—a thing which is now-a-days esteemed a sin above all sins, but which was constantly committed by those preachers, whom I have ever esteemed as the patterns of pulpit eloquence." "There are multitudes who cannot understand words composed of Latin, but must have the truth told them in round homely Saxon if it is to reach their hearts."

Fifty thousand volumes of the first two series of his Sermons have already been sold in America, and we anticipate for this series equal popularity. It has a beautiful view of Surrey Music Hall, where Spurgeon weekly preaches to 10,000 hearers.

THE BIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. From its Origin in Greece down to the Present Day. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. "Man is not born to solve the mystery of Existence; but he must nevertheless attempt it, in order that he may learn how to keep within the limits of the Knowable.—GOETHE.

"For I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,  
And the thoughts of men are widened by the process of the suns."—TENNYSON.

New Library Edition, much enlarged and thoroughly revised. In one volume. 8vo., pp. 825.

The first edition of this work was published about ten years ago. This new edition "may almost be considered a new work." "Scarcely a paragraph remains unaltered," and many important additions have been made. We have only space to indicate the main purpose of the author and give a few extracts illustrating his style of thought. He is a disciple of Auguste Comte, a thorough disbeliever "in the possibility of metaphysical certitude." He says: "The history of Philosophy presents the spectacle of thousands of intellects—some the greatest that have made our race illustrious—steadily concentrated on problems believed to be of vital importance, yet producing no other result than a conviction of the extreme facility of error, and the remoteness of any probability that truth can be reached. The only conquest has been critical, that is to say psychological." "Philosophy has been ever in movement, but the movement has been *circular*." "The difficulty is impossibility. No progress can be made, because no certainty is possible."



He places in strong contrast with this the "*linear progress of science*." The only value he attaches to the mighty efforts of Philosophy, is that it has been "the great initiator of science." "Having done this, its part is played. Our interest in it now is purely historical. The purport of this history is to show how and why the interest in philosophy has become purely historical." He does this by brief but comprehensive sketches of the lives and doctrines of the most celebrated philosophers of all ages, from Thales to Cousin (strangely omitting, however, Sir William Hamilton, and some others,) and writes upon them all, "weighed in the balances, and found wanting." He divides the history into eleven epochs, the last of which is entitled: "Philosophy finally relinquishing its place in favor of positive science." The "*Cours de Philosophie Positive*" of Comte, he here pronounces "the grandest, because, on the whole, the truest system which philosophy has yet produced;" in short, the whole work may be called an attempt to destroy all preceding philosophies, in order to enthrone Comte, whose philosophy is essentially materialistic and Atheistic, on their ruins.

The philosophic mind, however, which prefers a pure religious faith to Comte's speculations, will be far from admitting all he claims for that "powerful thinker," and will be led by this history, so far as it proves the uncertainty of all human reasoning, to bow more humbly at the feet of Him who alone is "the true light."

**MENTAL PHILOSOPHY**, including the Intellect, Sensibilities and Will. By JOSEPH HAVEN, Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in Amherst College. (Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857. 590 pp. 12mo.)

Our first thought on seeing the announcement of this work was that a new text-book of Mental Philosophy was much less needed now than a few years ago; and we rather wondered at the judgment of Prof. Haven in bringing forward this new candidate for public favor, when other works of acknowledged merit in the same department had scarcely been issued long enough to be generally known. But this suspicion of the author's wisdom soon yielded to a decided approval. His work has some qualities not often combined in one treatise, and in every respect is well adapted to the purpose for which it was intended.

As the title page indicates, the Sensibilities and the Will are the subject of discussion as well as the Intellect. The intellectual powers are classified as follows, viz: the Presentative Power, or Perception by the Senses; the Representative Power, including Imagination and Memory; the Reflective Power, including Generalization and Reasoning; and the Intuitive Power, corresponding to what Upham and Wayland call Original Suggestion.

The treatment of each subject is clear, and at the same time concise, while the style is both pure and elegant. A history of opinions on each of the general topics is appended to the discussion of that topic, and the sentiments of other writers are reviewed with candor.

An important characteristic of the book is the exact and clear analysis of each chapter,—a characteristic of great importance, but too seldom found in text books. If others judge as favorably as we of Prof. Haven's work, it will become *the* text-book in Mental Philosophy for colleges and higher seminaries of learning.

**THE LIFE AND TIMES OF AARON BURR**, Lieutenant-Colonel in the Army of the Revolution, United States Senator, Vice-President of the United States, etc. By J. PARTON, author of "Humorous Poetry of the English Language," "Life of Horace Greeley," etc. (N. Y.: Mason Bros. 1858. 12mo., pp. 696.)

The lives of few men have abounded with more remarkable vicissitudes, and scenes of thrilling yet tragic interest, than that of Aaron Burr,

The child of parents illustrious for intellect and piety—the grandson of *Jonathan Edwards*—we should have anticipated for him a career of distinguished honor and usefulness. But as we trace him through his checkered history—as we see him first an orphan, then a talented student, impressed with religious convictions, but confirmed in impenitence by the well-meant but injudicious counsel of Dr. Witherspoon, then the intrepid and successful soldier of the Revolution, the accomplished lawyer, the loving husband and doting father, the gifted senator, the honored Vice-President, then the wily politician, the blood-stained duellist, the fugitive from justice, the intriguing adventurer—and perhaps traitor—the criminal at the bar, the penniless, almost starving adventurer in foreign lands, the execrated outcast from society, but through all these changes cheerful, undaunted, of most winning manners, yet a sceptic and a debauchee,—without principle or conscience, and at last dying at the age of 81, as he had lived, “without God in the world,” pity and indignation at the wreck of such glorious powers, alternately struggle for the mastery.

Mr. Parton, with the amplest facilities at his command, has done what he could to rescue the character of Burr from the oblivion of infamy, and by presenting the noble traits which unquestionably adorned it, as well as the bad ones by which it is chiefly known, has aimed to show that “he was no angel: he was no devil; he was a man and a fillibuster.” The marvelous story is told in a pleasing manner, enlivened by numerous anecdotes, and sketches of the great men and parties of those eventful times, not without occasional hints of the biographer’s own opinions, both political and religious. He attempts to palliate and partly to excuse some of the most glaring faults of his hero, but tried even by Mr. Parton’s standard,—which is far below that of Christianity,—it must be confessed that Burr’s life was a sad failure, and replete with lessons of solemn warning.

**THE VIRGINIA SPRINGS.** By JOHN J. MOORMAN, M.D. Second Edition, (Richmond, Va.: J. W. Randolph. pp. 319.)

We found this an interesting and valuable hand-book during a sojourn last summer among the Virginia Springs; and we can cordially commend it to all who propose to visit those far and justly famed fountains of health. It furnishes all needful information on the subject of routes, lively and, as far as our knowledge goes, correct descriptions of the various localities, the peculiarities of the several waters, and practical directions for their use. An Appendix, containing notices of natural curiosities in the “Spring Region,” and a Map of Virginia, with the most recent lines of travel laid down, add to the value of the work. The author is a practical physician, for several years resident at the Greenbrier White Sulphur Springs, who may therefore be supposed to speak advisedly, having not merely theory but large experience, as to the nature and tendencies of mineral waters. His style is unpretending, but interesting, and perfectly perspicuous. Other pens not less able contribute to the book. The notice of the Healing Springs, from a young physician now no more, is glowing and beautiful. And we think that and similar notices would be serviceable not only to those who purpose visiting the Virginia Springs, but in inducing others so to do.

**THE GREYSON LETTERS:** Selections from the Correspondence of R. E. H. Greyson, Esq. Edited by HENRY ROGERS, author of “The Eclipse of Faith,” etc. (Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 12mo. 1857. pp. 511.)

Mr. Rogers is the *author*, and not only the *editor*, of these very piquant letters. He is already known as one of the ablest religious writers of the day, and a most successful defender of Christianity against the covert assaults of modern skepticism. This volume contains one hundred and eleven letters on a variety of subjects, but all of them bearing more or less directly on the gravest questions—religious and social—of the times.

We notice among the most interesting of these letters one on Death Bed Consolations; another on Christian Evidences; a third on Pulpit Style; four on Novel Reading; five to an Incipient Neologist; three on The Atonement, eight to a Friend who had become a Deist; three to a Homoeopathist; two on "Prayer;" one on the Argument for Immortality; and one to a Gentleman who would be a Christian, yet disputed all the peculiar facts and doctrines of historical Christianity. In the solid argument which forms the substratum of them, and the playful wit which decorates and enlivens the reasoning, they remind us of stern, rugged rocks, half concealed by climbing ivy, and adorned by blooming flowers springing from every crevice. They cannot fail to command a large and delighted circle of readers.

## LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE.

### FOREIGN.

N. Beets, *Paulus in den wichtigsten Augenblicken seines Lebens und Wirkens. Biblische Schilderungen. Aus dem Hollandischen von C. Gross.* Dr. J. König, *die Theologie der Psalmen.* 528 pp. Jordan Bucher, *Das Leben Jesu und der Apostel. Geschichtlich dargestellt.* 1. Lfg. It is to consist of sixteen or twenty parts. H. Hepp, *Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im 16. Jahrhundert,* in three volumes, from the press of Perthes. Ebrard, *Die Lehre, von der stellvertretenden Genugthung, as taught in the Scriptures. Corpus apologetarum christianorum sæculi II.* Edidit Joh. C. Thdr Otto. Jac. Kittseer, *Inhalt des Talmuds und seine Autorität, nebst einer geschichtlichen Einleitung. Aus den ersten Quellen geschöpft und unparteiisch behandelt.* E. J. Meyer, *Kritischer Kommentar zu der eschatologischen Rede Matth. 24. 25.* 1. Thl.: Die Einleitung. Dr. L. Remke, *Die messianischen Psalmen. Einleitung, Grundtext und Uebersetzung nebst einem philologisch-kritischen und historischen Commentar.* 1. Bd. 450 pp. D. G. M. Redslob, *Die biblischen Angaben ueber stiftung und Grund der Paschafeier vom Allegoristisch-kabbalistischen standpunkte aus betrachtet.* pp. 63.

The *Studien und Kritiken* completes with 1857, the thirtieth year of its existence. Its founders, Ullmann and Umbreit, still remain at the head of this valuable periodical. But many of its more distinguished contributors, as DeWette, Neander, Lucke, Gieseler, have passed away. A copious Index (*Register für die Jahrgänge 1848—1857*) *accompanis*, has just been issued. The titles of some of the articles in the last number of the work are: "The Last Words of David," by Fries; "Renewed Occupation with the Book of Job," by Umbreit; and "Some Further Remarks on the Passover Controversy of the Second Century," by Steitz.

A second edition of Auberlen's "*Der Prophet Daniel, und die Offenbarung Johannis.*" is in the press.

Meyer has published a third edition of his *Commentar ueber den Brief an die Galaten.* A writer in the September number of the *Literarisches Centralblatt* makes some strictures on the author's style of exposition, which are carried too far. Lunemann, one of Meyer's collaborators, has prepared the volume on the Epistle to the Hebrews.



## ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

## ORDINATIONS.

- W. A. Anthony, Corinth, Mississippi, Aug. 9.  
 Daniel Ash, Middlebourne, Virginia, Sept. 13.  
 R. M. Austin, Uniontown, Virginia, Sept. 27.  
 G. O. Atkinson, West Halifax, Vermont, Dec. 10.  
 V. K. Barber, Summit, New-York, Oct. 7.  
 G. W. Buzzell, Sheldon, Vermont, Sept. 30.  
 H. C. Beals, Adams' Village, New-York, Sept. 30.  
 L. M. Bennett, Tompkins, New-York, Sept. 2.  
 Charles D. W. Bridgman, Hoboken, New Jersey, Sept. 28.  
 G. W. Bickell, Cincinnati, Ohio, Sept. 27.  
 E. P. Brigham, Salem, New-York, Sept. 2.  
 A. H. Bliss, Stamford, Connecticut, Sept. 10.  
 Jos. Buzzell, Sheldon, Massachusetts, Sept. 30.  
 N. A. Bailey, Murfreesboro', Tennessee, Oct. 6.  
 Samuel Brooks, Beverly, Massachusetts, Oct. 22.  
 Moses Broyles, Indianapolis, Indiana, Nov. 22.  
 Wm. R. Connelly, Lowell, Michigan, Sept. 2.  
 Branch E. Cosby, Hephzibah, Virginia, Oct. 17.  
 C. S. Crain, South Otselic, New-York, Oct. 28.  
 Francis W. Chiney, Carmel, Georgia, Nov. 6.  
 Jos. D. Chambers, West Union, Kentucky, Dec. 1.  
 J. P. Chapin, Wayne, Maine, December 15.  
 P. S. Evans, Boston, Massachusetts, Oct. 1.  
 G. G. Ferguson, Peekskill, N. York, Aug. 26.  
 Lyman J. Fisher, Middletown, Ohio, Oct. 3.  
 J. N. Fairchild, W Troy, New-York, Nov. 5.  
 H. C. Fuller, Forestville, New-York, Dec. 7.  
 Pinckney Graham, Madison County, Mo. Oct. 11.  
 Wm. H. Gregory, Northville, Michigan, Nov. 18.  
 A. Gordon, San Francisco, California, Oct. 18.  
 Stephen Gilmore, Chatham County, North Carolina, Nov. 29.  
 L. M. Horn, Sulphur Spring, Kentucky, Aug. 30.  
 Jas. S. Hartfield, Mt. Zion, Georgia, Oct. 8.  
 Thomas R. Hawkins, Forest Hill, Virginia, Nov. 1.  
 E. Holroyd, Smyrna, New-York November 5.  
 S. W. Hull, Stockton, California, Sept. 28.  
 A. K. Harbaugh, Taneytown, Maryland, Nov. 27.  
 W. H. Hartin, South Carolina, November 29.  
 Luther R. Jaynes, Alliance, Ohio, Sept. 19.  
 William Jennings, Holland, N. Y., Sept. 30.  
 C. H. James, Phillipsville, New-York, Nov. 19.  
 E. G. Jefferson, Scottsville, Virginia, November.  
 H. S. Knowles, West Barre, Ohio, Sept. 30.  
 J. P. Kefauver, Roanoke County, Virginia, Dec. 11.  
 L. P. Lowery, Ridgeville, Alabama Nov. 7.  
 Silas Livermore, Broad Run, Virginia, Sept. 12.  
 E. B. Low, Hampton Falls, New Hampshire, Oct. 28.  
 A. H. Lackey, Goshen, Illinois, November 12.  
 Henry Lowry, Memphis, Tennessee, Nov. 1.  
 Jos. C. Maple, Cape Girardeau, Mo., Oct. 4.  
 C. C. Meador, Washington, D. C., Sept. 27.  
 Lewis Marshall, Broad Run, Virginia, Sept. 12.

W. H. H. Marsh, Bethesda, Pennsylvania, Sept. 25.

J. T. Milner, Van Buren county, Ia., Oct. 11.

J. B. Morse, Orange, New Jersey, Nov. 5.

J. C. McDaniel, LaFayette, Alabama, Nov. 28.

J. B. Maudelet, Louisville, Kentucky, Dec. 13.

John C. Power, Arkansas, July 19.

J. M. Peay, Beaver Dam, Kentucky, Sept. 26.

Hiram K. Pevear, Roxbury, Massachusetts, Dec. 3.

B. J. Powell, Chester, Ohio, November 5.

W. T. Potter, Oxford, New-York, December 16.

W. H. Rice, Marshallville, Ga., October 18.

J. W. F. Rogers, Holly Spring, N. C., Nov. 8.

Samuel D. Ross, Greenville, Michigan, Nov. 25.

J. C. Stevens, Clifton, New-York, Oct. 1.

Lyman G. Shipman, Middletown, Ohio, Oct. 3.

Charles Sholtz, Smooth Prairie, Ill., Sept. 16.

H. B. Slater, Saratoga, Minnesota Territory, Oct. 13.

James Suvine, Vernon, Michigan, November 4.

John Shorthill, Mahoning, Pennsylvania, Oct. 12.

Judson W. Truesdell, Vestal, New-York, Sept. 23.

Wm. C. Tilden, Middletown, Pennsylvania, Nov. 12.

Ed. Tompkins, Tivoli, New-York, Dec. 9.

Adoniram J. Waterbury, Petersburg, N. Y., Sept. 30.

Philip A. Woods, Ritchie Co., Virginia, Oct. 24.

Kelsey Walling, Green Point, N. Y., Oct. 28.

J. T. West, Cedar Town, Tenn., November 1.

Luman Yale, Guilford, New-York, Sept. 16.

#### CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

Smooth Prairie, Ill., Sept. 16.

Cincinnati, Ohio, Sept. 27.

Horton, Iowa, Sept. 2.

Oakfuskee, Ala., July 10.

New Hartford, Ill., Aug. 8.

S. Burlington, Ill., Aug. 7.

Hamilton, N. C., Aug. 1.

Manning, S. C., Sept. 28.

Miami Co., Ind., Sept. 20.

Morocco, Ill., Sept. 5.

New Hope, Ind., Oct. 5.

Madison, Ohio, Oct. 7.

Gibsonville, Ohio, Sept.

Burlington, Iowa, Sept., 17.

Pine Plain, Ala., Sept. 25.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Oct. 22.

Epworth, Iowa, Sept. 25.

Tiffin, Ohio, Oct. 20.

Beechers, Mich., Oct. 20.

Mechanics Falls, Me., Oct. 27.

Hillsboro, N. H., Oct. 29.

Orange, N. J., Nov. 5.

Newark Village, N. Y., Nov.

Clarksville, Ill., Oct. 31.

Eatonton, Ga., Nov. 1.

New York, N. Y., Dec. 3.

Zanesville, Ohio, Nov. 7.

Utica, Ind., Sept. 19.

Denison, Iowa, Nov. 1.

Marshall, Ill., Nov. 14.

Calaveras, Cal., July 26.

Franklin Co., Va., Nov. 11.

Camp Creek, Ohio, Dec. 2.

Centreville, Ohio, Nov.

Liberty, Ill., Nov. 29.

Fontenelle, N. T. Dec. 1.

#### DEATHS.

A. Irons, Sheridan, N. Y., July 2, aged 54.

A. M. Lewis, Huntsville, Mo., August 26.

Joseph Grisham, Georgia, April 9, aged 67.

Rufus W. Griswold, N. Y., Aug. 28.

J. Baxter, Georgetown, Ky., Aug. 30, aged 69.

Philip Awtry, Randolph co., Georgia, Sept. 13, aged 50.

Augustus Hubbard, Limington, Me., Oct. 5, aged 39.

James R. Miller, Bullock co., Ga., Oct., aged 43-

Cyrus Churchill, Almont Mich., November 4, aged 53.

Francis H. Brown, Jonesboro', Ill., J. D. Jones. S. Danville, N. Y., July 27, aged 56.

H. A. Brown, Greenfield, Ohio, Oct. 15, aged 33.

S. S. Lattimore, Aberdeen, Miss., October 17.

John Shepard, Port Byron, N. Y., October 14, aged 93.

Isaac Devinnell, Tolland, Conn., Nov. 11, aged 79.

Robert B. Goforth, Clinton, Mo., November 7, aged 46.

Henry Miller, Shelbyville, Tenn., September 21, aged 50.

Dan'l. Whitaker, Toungoo, Burmah, August 14.

N. J. Norton, Cordova, Ill., November 12, aged 37.

Zebedee Delano, N. Berwick, Maine, Aug. 3, aged 90.

P. M. Swaim, Rockville, Ill., November 23, aged 39.

James Reed, Hamburg, N. Y., November 27, aged 60.

John S. Lee, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, November 13, aged 74.

James Phillips, Darlington, South Carolina, November 17, aged 55.

Elisha Perryman, Richmond County, Georgia, December 1, aged 90.

John Rushing, Rutherford County, Tennessee, Aug 17, aged 65.

Wm. L. Anderson, Arkansas, November 15, aged 55.

Seamon Moore, Mississippi, October 23, aged 42.

George J. Miles, Muscatine, Iowa, December 10, aged 55.

D. G. Swanston, St. Mary's, Ga., Oct.

#### DEDICATIONS.

Bridgeton, N. J., Sept. 23, cost \$18,000.

Shutesbury, Mass., Sept. 22.

Sharon, N. C., Sept. 20.

North Fork, Va., Sept. 27.

Damariscotta, Me., Sept. 24.

Concord, Va., Sept. 13, cost \$3,000.

Amboy, Ill., Sept. 13, cost \$5250.

Berean, Chicago, Ill., Oct. 11, cost \$1400.

Marion, Va., Sept. 27.

Middletown, Ohio, Sept. 27, cost \$7,000.

Starks, Me., Oct. 15.

Bear Creek, N. C., Aug. 2, cost \$2500.

Quincy, Ill., Oct. 7.

Manchester, N. H. Oct.

Taylorsville, Ky., Nov. 17, cost \$8000.

Fayetteville, N. Y. Nov. 19.

Ripon, Wisconsin, December 1.

Beaver Dam, Kentucky, November.

South Danvers, Mass., November 19, cost \$7,000.

Franklinton, North Carolina, November 29.

Westville, Indiana, Dec. 6, \$2700.

Staunton, Virginia, December.

Westmoreland County, Penna., Nov.



# BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE, THE BRITISH REVIEWS, AND THE FARMER'S GUIDE.

L. SCOTT & CO., NEW YORK, continue to publish the following leading British Periodicals, viz:

- 1 LONDON QUARTERLY, (Conservative).
- 2 THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, (Whig).
- 3 THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, (Free Church).
- 4 THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, (Liberal).
- 5 BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAG. (Tory).

These periodicals ably represent the three great political parties of Great Britain—Whig, Tory and Radical,—but politics forms only one feature of their character. As organs of the most profound writers on Science, Literature, Morality and Religion, they stand, as they have ever stood, unrivalled in the world of letters, being considered indispensable to the scholar and professional man, while to the intelligent reader of every class they furnish a more correct and satisfactory record of the current literature of the day, throughout the world, than can be possibly obtained from any other source.

**EARLY COPIES.**—The receipt of Advanced Sheets from the British publishers gives additional value to these Reprints, inasmuch as they can now be placed in the hands of subscribers about as soon as the original editions.

TERMS.	Per ann.
For any one of the four Reviews.....	\$3 00
For any two of the four Reviews.....	5 00
For any three of the four Reviews.....	7 00
For all four of the Reviews.....	8 00
For Blackwood's Magazine.....	3 00
For Blackwood and three Reviews.....	9 00
For Blackwood and the four Reviews.....	10 00

Payments to be made in all cases in advance. Money current in the State where issued will be received at par.

**CLUBBING.**—A discount of twenty-five per cent, from the above price will be allowed to CLUBS ordering four or more copies of any one or more of the above works. Thus: Four copies of Blackwood, or of one Review, will be sent to one address for \$9; four copies of the four Reviews and Blackwood for \$30; and so on.

**POSTAGE.**—In all the principal Cities and Towns, these works will be delivered free of postage. When sent by mail, the Postage to any part of the United States will be but twenty-four cents a year for "Blackwood," and but fourteen cents a year for each of the Reviews.

N. B. The price in Great Britain of the five Periodicals above named is \$31 per annum.

## THE FARMER'S GUIDE.

*To Scientific and Practical Agriculture.*

By HENRY STEPHENS, F. R. S., of Edinburgh, and the late J. P. NORTON, Professor of Scientific Agriculture in Yale College. New Haven. 2 vols. Royal Octavo. 1600 pages, and numerous Wood and Steel Engravings.

This is, confessedly, the most complete work on Agriculture ever published, and in order to give it a wider circulation the publishers have resolved to reduce the price to

**FIVE DOLLARS FOR THE TWO VOLUMES!!**

When sent by mail (post paid) to California and Oregon the price will be \$7.—To every other part of the Union, and to Canada (post paid), \$6. This work is not the old "Book of the Farm."

Remittances for any of the above publications should always be addressed, post-paid, to the Publishers,

LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,  
No. 56 Gold street, New York.